THE BIRTH OF NEW INDIA

ht Registered

hts Reserved

r translation apply to

For perm

THEOSOPHI PUBLISHING HOUSE

Adya. as, India.

THE BIRTH OF NEW INDIA

A COLLECTION OF WRITINGS AND SPEECHES ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

BY

ANNIE BESANT

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE
ADYAR, MADRAS, INDIA

T. P. H., LONDON, BENARES, KROTONA, U.S.A.

INDIAN BOOK DEPOT, BOMBAY

1917

PUBLISHERS' PREFACE

When a popular and versatile author has been writing for over forty years and when she happens to be the world's greatest living orator who has continuously used her magic tongue for the service of her race, any attempt to collect in a volume all writings and speeches, even on a particular theme, is a very hard task indeed.

Mrs. Annie Besant is such a personage. She has been working strenuously in India since 1893, and with her powerful pen and golden voice has contributed greatly in heralding the birth of New India. She has toiled in all the four departments of human activity, not only with energy and enthusiasm but with clockwork regularity and patient perseverance.

In this volume an effort is made to bring together a few of her writings and speeches which have contributed towards that glorious object. It is not possible to bring within the compass of a handy and saleable volume more than we have done. Judicious selection is all a publisher can do in an instance

like this, and that we believe we have succeeded in doing.

But the reader must not run away with the idea that this volume will give him full knowledge of the intellectual labours of Mrs. Besant, which almost invariably have brought forth laudable activities and institutions. The reader will herein find the indicative finger for further study of a more detailed character, pertaining to Mrs. Besant's noble work for the Motherland. But we must remind him, once again, that this volume must not be regarded as complete in itself. A few notes on each of the departments will show him what we mean.

Take Political: the reader must peruse *How India Wrought for Freedom, India and the Empire,* and *India —A Nation,* already published, as also the numerous pamphlets in the two well known series, the "New India Political Pamphlets" and "The Home Rule Pamphlets". Mrs. Besant's Congress Speeches are being published in a separate volume, which contains what will be a memorable document, her Congress Presidential Address of 1917.

Then in Educational: we have been able to give the reader a glimpse of the many-sided character of Mrs. Besant's work. We do not think any

publisher could better the selection without making the volume unwieldly, disproportionate or unsaleable. As big a volume as this would be necessary to do adequate justice to the subject pertaining to this part of the volume.

For the amplification of the third department, Social, the reader will have to turn to Mrs. Besant's admirable lectures issued as a book under the heading *Wake Up, India.* Therein will be found definite pronouncements on important social problems such as Foreign Travel, Child-Marriage, the Depressed Classes, Industrial Problems, Mass Education, Women's Education, Colour Bar, and the Caste System.

Above all, Mrs. Besant is a religious and spiritual teacher, and we feel we have not done justice to her in making up this department. The difficulty has been this: all her best religious lectures have been delivered at the Annual Conventions of the Theosophical Society and in England, and they have been published in book form every year. Her lectures on Hinduism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Jainism, Sikhism, are to be found in two volumes—*Four Great Religions* and *The Religious Problem in India.* We have given in this section a short list of her religious works and have indicated

the nature of each of them. Mrs. Besant is at her very best and is most inspiring when she speaks or writes on religious matters, but no one volume can do her full justice, much less one-fourth of a volume.

We must apologise to the reader for one thing: the arrangement has left something to be desired. In a subsequent edition a rearrangement will be made which will give to some of the selected essays or lectures a more fitting place than is assigned to them in the present volume. And they will be arranged under each head in order of date of delivery. Also a few errors, due to hasty printing and proof-reading have crept into the book, which of course will be duly corrected.

Our aim has been a book to be sold at a nominal price, with the view to enable the Indian public, and the greater public beyond the seas interested in Indian problems, to get a taste of the high and noble thoughts which have materialised a Movement in this country. We think we have realised the aim, for our volume is of 450 pages, to be sold at Rs. 1-8 or 2s., and it clearly shows the great part Mrs. Besant has played in the making of Indian history. As a result of which, the Birth of New India is upon us!

December 1917.

CONTENTS

PAGE

I. POLITICAL:

India's Awakening 3
The Indian Nation 28
India, Her Past and Her Future . . . 37
Indian Emigration and Trade Unionism . 61
The Swadeshi Movement 64
Federation 70
Indian Self-Government 78
India's Mission among Nations . . . 85

II. EDUCATIONAL:

Education as a National Duty . . . 89
The Education of Hindu Youth . . . 107
The Necessity for Religious Education . . 116
Religious Education 138
Education of the Depressed Classes . . 142
The Education of Indian Girls . . . 149
Girls' Education 157
The Danger of Education 163
Young Men's Associations 170
National Education 173

III. SOCIAL:

The Bearing of Religious Ideals on Social Reconstruction 199
The Necessity for Social Reform . . . 217
Eastern Castes and Western Classes . . 237
The Need for Ideals 258
On the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals . 274

The Protection of Children 286
The Indenture System 294
Widow-Remarriage 299
Indian Women 303

IV. RELIGIOUS :

The Nature of My Religious Work . . . 313
The Ancient Indian Ideal of Duty . . . 317
Islam in the Light of Theosophy . . . 329
The Work of the Theosophical Society in India 348
The Value of Theosophy in the Raising of India 368
The Place of Religion in the Life of a Student. 392
Brahmacharya 396
Evolution 399
A Plea for the Simpler Life of the East . 401
Religious Books 423

V. ANNIE BESANT'S FAREWELL TO HER BROTHERS AND SISTERS IN INDIA ON THE EVE OF HER INTERNMENT :

To My Brothers and Sisters in India . . 431

I. POLITICAL

INDIA'S AWAKENING[1]

BROTHERS,

For many long years past I have urged on you, and on those like you in all parts of India, the necessity of a spiritual awakening before the awakening of a material prosperity became possible. You know that during many years past, since the Theosophical Society was founded on these shores, the importance of religion, the necessity of spiritual knowledge, has been constantly insisted upon, has been constantly urged; and in doing this, those who brought the renewal of the message were only treading in the footsteps of their far-off predecessors, who have ever declared that from the Spirit come forth all things that exist, and that without the life of the Spirit not even animal, vegetable or mineral life were possible. That profound truth in the ancient philosophy of India is the only foundation for progress of every kind. One Spirit, and one only; one Life and none other; every form from the one living Essence, every being rooted in the everlasting One.

In the past I have sometimes traced for you the steps of India's descent; how from the time of her great spirituality, when the life of the Spirit was seen as the sun in the heavens, how from that time downwards, with the decay of spirituality, went also the decay of the desirable things. And I remember how often I have pressed upon you how first there came

[1] A lecture delivered in 1910.

the lessening of the spiritual life, then the decay of the original side of intellectual thought, of the creative intelligence, and only when those had gone far down into the twilight, came the slow decay of material prosperity. You may remember that I have put it to you that the awakening, the reviving, of Indian life must follow the order in which the descent had gone. First of all, the reviving of true spirituality, of true religion, of the vital understanding of the profoundest truths of all existence; then, after that had made its way to an appreciable extent, must come the training, the culture, the guidance of the intelligence, so that a wisely planned and wisely guided education might train the future workers of the land. I remember saying to you that when the spiritual life has again become potent, when the educational life has again become pervasive, then only can material prosperity safely return. To men with the knowledge of the One, with the unselfishness which grows out of the realisation of the common life, to their hands only can be safely entrusted the material guidance of the people. It is along that line that Indian progress has gone for many a year past. First, the great revival of religion. It began with the revival of Buddhism in the Island of Ceylon, where, as you may remember, education swiftly followed after the re-awakened faith. Then came the great revival of Hinduism, that has spread from one end of the land to the other, from the Himalayas to Tuticorin, and everywhere is recognised as a fact. Then followed the recognition that in a rightly directed education lay the only way of training for the motherland citizens who would be worthy of her past and therefore capable of building her future; out of that will arise all the varied activities of a full and rich national life, and we shall see the nation, which India never yet

has been, but which India shall be in the days that are dawning.

Now the change to the material awakening has come somewhat more swiftly than most of us expected. I should say it has come a little too soon, were it not that I believe that over the destinies of nations there are hands that guide, so wise and so loving, that nothing can really come either too soon or too late. But, to our eyes, looking with purblind vision, we should sometimes be almost inclined to say that events are travelling in India a little more rapidly than is well. For we need for the wise guiding of a material movement men trained from boyhood in religion and in true wisdom, so that the brain may be balanced and calm, the hands strong and steady; for the moment you touch the popular mind and the popular heart you awaken forces that are apt to go beyond the control of wisdom, and it needs a nucleus of wise and steady thinkers in order that a popular movement may find its way aright.

Let us, then, at this moment of immense importance to India's future, consider what ought to be the line most wisely to be followed in the great rush which is coming upon us. I pause a moment on the sentence just uttered, of the hands that guide, and the wisdom and the love which shape a nation's destinies. It is no new thought to you, who have grown up in the atmosphere in which the celestial and the physical worlds are mingling—it is no new thought to you that the Devas, the Shining Ones, mingle in the affairs of men. Nor should it be a new thought to you—although to many it may now seem strange—that every nation also has its own Devas who guide its affairs, who shape its present and its future.

Let me, then, remind you that in the vast unseen Hierarchy who mingle in human affairs there are Devas of many grades, as well as the great Rishis who are the planners and regulators of events. First of all, there is the plan of the Lord Himself, of Ishvara, the Ruler of the system, who sketches, in the dawn of the creative days, the plan of evolution along which His universe shall go. Out of the innumerable conceivabilities in the mind of the Supreme, some are chosen by the Ishvara, who builds a system, as the material for His system, and are woven into the plan for His unfolding. No pen, save that of His finger, writes that wondrous drama, which slowly is unfolded in the history of the evolving universe, written so that none may change, written so that none may amend, written by a wisdom inconceivable to us, and by a love of which the deepest love of the human heart is but the faintest and most shadowy reflection.

Then the working out of that plan is given into the hands of those whom we may call His Ministers, the great Ones who come into the system from systems long gone by, to co-operate with Him in the shaping of a new humanity; into their hands His plan is given, and theirs the brains of wisdom and the hands of strength that bring that plan into the details that we call history. They plan out the working and give to every nation the acting of a part in that great plan; to the Deva who rules the nation, and who has under his control a hierarchy of lesser Devas, that part is given to be worked out in the history of the people. Now the plan is for all humanity, and not for one nation only, and each nation, in turn, has its part to play; each nation, in turn, is cast either for the moment's weal or the moment's woe; and those only can read aright the history of humanity, who know the powers that work behind the veil; for you

cannot manage a household unless you know the will of the householder, and before you can realise the wisdom of household guidance, you must know the wants of the children and of the other members of the house. So in the history of peoples you cannot judge by the statesmen, the Generals, the Admirals, and the monarchs, who all work out the various tasks that are given them to do. You must look behind them to those who guide, to the great Householder, the supreme Grihastha of the system. When we come to India, we know that all this is true of India and of India's Deva-King, who stands high above the nation and works out, millennium after millennium, the parts which are given to him for his nation to play in the world's history; these parts have outlined the nation's story through all the difficulties, the dangers, the humiliations of the past. On that I may not dwell long now. Partly to-morrow morning, in speaking of Kurukshetra, I shall have to explain the "how" and the "why" of the difficulties through which India has passed. For the moment I leave them untouched, to turn to that which immediately concerns us now, to the present and its working.

First of all, in order that India might again take her place amongst the nations of the world, mightier even than in the past—a glorious past—there came the spiritual messengers, the messengers who were to revive the varied religions of the land. That has been done to a great extent as regards Hinduism and Buddhism. But you must remember that the other religions must also have, and to some extent have had, each in its own place, the advantage of the same spiritual and enlivening influence. Look at the community called Zoroastrian, and see how it has, of late years, become spiritualising in its tendencies instead of materialising as in the past. The great faith of Islam is

the one which only shows in a very limited measure the enlivening influence of the new spiritual impulse, yet there also the same working is beginning, and there also are signs of the spreading of the same influence, so that Islam also shall take her place, spiritually alive and spiritually potent, to bear her part in the reshaping of India as she is to be. That work is not finished, in fact never will be finished ; it is rather ever continuing, but all the first great steps are taken, and success in that is assured.

Passing to education, there an immense amount has been done and far more has yet to be done, as I shall show to you in a few moments. We have only begun the very A B C of the educational reform which is necessary in order to make India what she should be. Now when a nation does not move sufficiently swiftly along the path of progress, when she does not rouse herself enough to the voice that appeals, that warns, and that counsels, then the Deva of the nation takes other means in hand, in order to awaken his people and make them see along what lines their path should be trodden. And these other means used by the Deva are goads. They are like the whip that touches the horse when he is too lazy, and what you look on as national misfortunes, as things that you even cry out against with insistence and with passion, these are very often, rightly seen, the goads which make a nation move a little faster towards the goal on which the Deva's eyes are fixed. This is especially true just now, and will serve my purpose well as an illustration with regard to education. Education is a matter that belongs to the nation when rightly understood. Fathers and guardians are the people who ought to fashion the national education. How long have I been urging upon you to take this matter of education into your own hands, and not leave it for others to

guide and plan. How long, in my travels up and down through the country, have I urged upon you the importance of this question of national education. I remember how, about three years ago, when I spoke in Bombay, I urged on every man and on every woman, mother and father, that on them lay the heavy responsibility of the education and the training of the child. I remember how there I urged upon you that your own interest, if nothing else, should stir you to the guidance of your children's education; for you do not want to continue to overcrowd, as you are doing, the ranks of the so-called learned professions and the ranks of the Government service. Those are not things which make nations great, however necessary they may be, and however necessary they are, for the mechanism and administration of the nation. The things that make a nation great, from the material standpoint, are not the learned professions and Government service, but scientific agriculture, well devised manufactures, thoughtfully planned arts and and crafts, and the innumerable forms of workmanship that go to the building up of national wealth. But along the lines on which education has been carried on, this has been left on one side, and mind you, the blame for that does not lie on the Government; it lies on the people. It is useless and idle to blame Government, when you are the people who can do it, if you have the heart, the will, and the perseverance. Out of your pocket comes every rupee that the Government spends on education. Out of your pocket come the far too few rupees that build the colleges and schools, save the missionary establishments. If, instead of sending your boys to Government college and missionary schools, you built your own schools, and had your own teachers, you might guide education exactly as you would. It is not that there is not money enough in the country. I know it is said

that India is poor; so she is, in a sense, poor, that is, as regards the masses of her people. But not too poor to build colleges and schools for your children while you are able to maintain, as you are doing, large crowds of men as mendicants, in the full strength of vigorous life, who are innocent of all sacred learning, innocent of the light, who have nothing of the Sannyasi but the cloth that covers them, and who are yet fed and sheltered by the crore. India is not poor so long as your Chetties and Banias can give lakhs upon lakhs of rupees for the restoration of ancient temples and the gilding of their pinnacles. You do not need to increase your charities; that is not wanted; but oh! if you would only turn them into channels that fertilise instead of channels that corrupt, India would have wealth enough to educate her sons and daughters, and to make possible a new life in the future.

I do not speak against the restoration of temples. That is well. It is well that man should worship, rightly, nobly and rationally. I do not speak against the restoration of temples, but I do speak against the mere restoration that leaves the priesthood ignorant and profligate. I do speak against the restoration of a temple where no school lives under its shadow, and where children are not taught by those whose duty it is to teach—less gilding on the pinnacles of temples, and more gilding of learning in the hearts of boys and girls. And if you would still keep your temples in order, but spend some of the money that is wasted on vast crowds of idle mendicants on the education of your children, how rapidly would India rise in the scale of nations, and how quickly she would claim her right place among the peoples of the world.

And that is your work. Last year in speaking on "Theosophy in Relation to Politics," I urged upon

you the formation of Educational Boards in every district of India. Now Government has nothing to do with that. You do not need to ask for Government permission or authority. You have only to gather a few of your cleverest men and Princes together and make them into an Educational Board, for a definitely outlined area. What is wanted is not Government help. It is your work. What is wanted is self-devotion, energy, initiative, the willingness to go through years of drudgery, for only in that way can true education be built up. This has not yet been acted on. The idea, when spoken about anywhere, causes a good deal of cheering, but only in a few places has there been any real earnest work, even in starting an Indian school. Hence a goad was needed, and it has been applied. An Education Commission goes all round the country. The Education Commission presents its report, and the representative of the vast majority of those whose children have to be educated under the new law presents a minority report—a minority of one. Now, certainly, if you weigh heads, instead of counting them, that minority might outweigh many, for that one was Mr. Justice Gurudas Bannerji. He knew very well what sort of education was wanted by the people, but he was only one, and the English majority shaped the Education Bill, and passed the Act. When it was passed, a number of a very wise protests were made—thoughtful, well considered and rational—but why only protests? Why were not the protests followed by the formation of Boards, which should do that which the protesters wished? The protest was wisely made. Such protests are necessary, but they should be followed by action, for thought that is not followed by action acts like a gangrene in the human mind. Better remain silent, better not even think, if you are not prepared to act; better not think, unless

you are prepared to put your activity into action, for in the higher spheres, as you know, thought produces action; down here, thought, and especially talk, without action does not get a nation very far along the line of progress. So all the energy flows out in the talk, and nothing is done. The national Deva thought something more in the way of pressure was wanted, and the Education Act became law. And very well it did. You do not approve of it, nor do I; but still it was wanted, because nothing else would stir the people into action. That was why I said that where a people would not move by exhortation and advice, some goad was used in order to stir them into activity. Now that you find education has become dearer, that to educate the boys strains to breaking the narrow incomes of the fathers; now that you see Higher Education is being more and more blocked to the class that needs it most—a class hereditarily learned, but always poor and now largely shut out from the costly education of the day; now that the education question has come in this form: "You must take this costly education or nothing"—you must begin to say: "No, it shall not be nothing. It shall be something, created by my own hands and out of my own money and brains." But in order that the goad may serve its purpose well, it is necessary that there should be hot and bitter feelings in the hearts of many of the people affected. It is that which makes the steam that drives the engine. It is that which presently makes the piston to go backwards and forwards and the wheels to turn. It is that which gives force, though it also causes an immense amount of excitement and foolish talk. These things are necessary, in order to generate the forces which make the engine of the nation move. So that the Education Act is, as I regard it, a goad to make us struggle against it, as we are obliged to struggle at

Benares, in keeping our fees low. I am glad it has passed, because it has—I hope it has—given the impulse which will make men take the education of their children into their own hands.

But now, how? By beginning at the right end and not at the wrong. First, by making your Educational Boards all over country; next by creating colleges and Universities, and most of all making such a public opinion, especially among the Indian Princes, the great merchants, and employers of labour, as shall induce them to recognise the degrees given by the Indian Universities as valid credentials for those who are seeking employment. Until you have done that, you have done nothing. It is no good even making a University, unless you have made a body of people who are prepared to take its graduates when they have taken their degrees, and thus open to them means of livelihood. It is no good beginning with boys. You must begin with men.

Now I will tell you why I object to boys being thrown into political conflicts. They may ruin their whole lives in a sudden surge of excitement, and in their manhood bitterly reproach those who took advantage of their inexperience. While education is under the control of Government, and the fate of every boy is in the hands of the officials of his town, it is cruel to fling the lads against them. A boy dismissed from school or college and refused a leaving certificate, has his education ruined and his future livelihood destroyed. When people unaccustomed to political action suddenly plunge into it, they are apt to think after they act instead of before. Here lies one of the dangers in India's Awakening, and that is why I said I fear it has come too soon. Those who are trained in politics, as in my past life I have been—for I have taken a large part in the political struggles of the

people in England, and I worked there in difficult times side by side with my old friend, Mr. Charles Bradlaugh—make it, as we made it, one of the rules of political life never to tell another man to go where there was risk, where we did not go in front; never to tell a procession to go where there was danger, unless we walked in front, so that we should be the first people on whom blows fell. It was the glory of Charles Bradlaugh, when he lay on his death-bed, that despite his struggles and difficulties, there was not one home that had been made desolate by him, not one man who had gone to jail for the work that he had asked him to do. The front is the place of the leader; it is the place of the man, and not the place of the boy.

There is another reason why it is bad to send boys to the front. There can be no wise politics without thought beforehand. People who shout first and think afterwards make a mob, they do not make a political party; and that is the thing that the boy does. How much do you think a boy of this height [pointing to a boy about four feet] knows about the good or the evil of the Partition of Bengal? He shouts out and protests. It is bad training for the future. In the college, students should discuss political questions, social questions and economic questions. They should debate them, discuss them, and talk them over in every possible way. We train them to do that in the Central Hindu College. But we do not allow them to protest against the Government. And the reason is a very simple one. When they have discussed these questions beforehand, when they have talked them over, then, when they have gone out into the world, they will be ready to form rational opinions. But if, before they study and understand the questions of the day, they shout

out their approval or disapproval out of empty heads, they make a great deal of noise, but noise of no value, like bladders which, when beaten make a noise, but collapse if you prick them with a pin. I do not want India to work along those lines. Train your boys to think first and then to form opinions, not to call out first and then wonder what they have been shouting for. That is bad moral training. It puts boys on wrong lines, and it takes away that profound sense of responsibility which ought to be at the heart of every one who mingles in political life. For remember what playing at politics means. Remember that it means playing with property; it means playing with liberty; it means playing with the lives of men. Leaders in the political arena have to remember all that, when they take the responsibility of calling men to action. When you have a man like Mr. Gokhale—who has trained himself by years upon years of study and of self-denial, by his self-sacrificing work in the Fergusson College, for twenty years, on Rs. 75 a month and a retiring pension of Rs. 25 a month—when you have a man trained in that way, and one who studies every subject to the very bottom before he speaks about it, then you have a man who may be trusted, and of whom a nation may well be proud, a worthy leader in the political arena.

In the matter of education, why not begin to act? You know you send your boys still by thousands and thousands to missionary schools, and it is a disgrace—not to the missionaries, for they are doing work which they honestly think to be to the glory of God and for the good of all men; they believe that their religion is much better than yours, and I am bound to say that they love it better, because they work for it much harder, as a rule. You ought to remember that your religion is the oldest of all living religions,

and the most perfect in its range and in its details. Surely, it is not for you to take the children, whose bodies you have given, and, robbing them of their birthright, put them into other hands and mould them in an anti-Indian fashion. The missionaries do not make many Christians. Here and there they do, as in Trichinopoly, but, as a rule, they do not make many converts. But I tell you what they do. They dig up the roots of devotion and religion in the plastic soil of the boy's heart. They wither them with ridicule, they trample them down with sarcasm, and when the boy grows up, he grows up an unbeliever in all religions, a bad Hindu and not a Christian—a kind of hybrid, who is of no use to his country. When you de-spiritualise an Indian, you denationalise him. Why does that go on? *Because you do not care.* It sounds hard to say so, but it is true. If you cared, it would not last for another month. What does it want to bring about the change? A few men in every town to band themselves together into an Educational Committee; a few rich merchants to be visited and asked to subscribe so much per month for some years, and then the putting up of a building for a school, and the sending of the boys. There is one difficulty in your way—the recognition of the school by the Government, and that is a serious difficulty as things are, for unless the school is recognised, the pupils of the school are not permitted to go on into the University. Still, if you would work well and steadily and perseveringly, you would, I think, be able to win recognition in the long run and, if not, to do without it. I have in my mind what happened in Trichinopoly two or three years ago, when I got a few people together who said that they would collect monthly subscriptions in the town to have a college of their own. The Roman Catholics have a college, and some other missionary body has a college, but the Hindus

and the Mussalmans have no college of their own. Did they succeed? Not a bit of it. I myself drew up a proposal for the Madras University. The University took it into consideration. But where were the funds? The people of Trichinopoly did not care enough to keep their children from the missionary schools and colleges, to supply the small sum, comparatively, that is wanted to make a College there, where the Hindu and Mussalman boys might learn apart from Christian influence. Not long ago in another southern town, there was a College for sale, and for sale without money. It is not often that you can buy anything without money. The Government wanted to get rid of it, but the Government asked for a body of Hindu gentlemen who would pledge themselves to conduct the College. But they could not get them. The College went a-begging and still is in Government hands.

These are the things which you have to take seriously, especially now that the people are awakening. For things are going on swiftly, and unless you bestir yourselves to make your educational mechanism, the tide of enthusiasm will flow into channels that will be harmful instead of useful. Do not call your boys out from the present schools until you have others in which to receive them. When you can say to your son: "My boy, walk across the road to that school, which is our own," then by all means do it. Then you can do without missionary schools. Otherwise you will find yourselves in endless trouble. What you should do in Madras, and do at once, is to begin the formation of a great organisation of leading, wealthy, influential people, who will give employment to your boys, if need be, when the pinch comes, and Government refuses to recognise your colleges or

Universities. I believe in Indian Universities for Indians, where Indian degrees shall be given in Arts, and Science, and in Industries that are useful for the national unfolding.

I see they are now going to teach French and German, Latin and Greek. Very useful, no doubt. So many of you will want to go to France, and talk French in Paris. So many of you will want to go to Germany, and enter into trade concerns there. Latin and Greek you may want to read, in order to understand mediæval Christian writers, I suppose, for your spiritual training. Unless this absurdity is the idea, it is difficult to see why they should be preferred to Sanskrit and Arabic, for Sanskrit is as good and as intellectual a training as either of these two languages—Greek being but a child of Sanskrit—and Arabic is the language in which the mediæval learning of Islam is embodied. Our Mussalman brothers are not at present wise enough to vindicate Islamic learning by translating the treasures of that knowledge, which from Bagdad spread into Europe. Arabic and Sanskrit, these are the two classical languages for India, not Latin and Greek. Instead of French and German, you should teach English and one vernacular, one common language which would serve everywhere as a means of communication between educated and uneducated alike. You ought to make Hindi a second language throughout the land. I have heard it said that Tamil has a literature which is magnificent, and this must certainly not be left to die. But in addition to the boy's own vernacular, he should always learn Hindi, for that is the most widely spread vernacular of the country, and one can go from one end of the land to the other and talk in Hindi to all, save the most illiterate people in every part of it. If you had

Sanskrit or Arabic, according to the religion of the boy, Hindi as a common tongue, a thorough knowledge of his own vernacular, and then the necessary English for all dealings with foreign countries, and in Government and Court matters, you would have an education, so far as languages are concerned, that would make a boy ready for the future, and enable him to take up his work in the world as soon as he goes into it.

The most important thing, which I have often urged, is technical education, and above all thorough education in agriculture. Unfortunately you have only one general business here, namely, agriculture. At least it might be made very much better than it is at present, so that famines, which are a recurring horror in the land, might be prevented. Famines are preventible things, and things that ought to be prevented. But they can only be prevented by a wiser system of agriculture on the one hand, and by the building up of manufacturing industries throughout the land on the other.

But, mind you, the manufactures that you want are the manufactures of this country. Here arts and crafts are fast dying. Your weaving craft is dying out of existence, because its products are not bought. That brings me to the next point, for education here slips into economics. Why is it that the weavers of cloths, the potters, and metal workers, and the makers of beautiful objects of all kinds, the weavers of shawls in Kashmir, and of muslins and silks in other parts of the land, why are they slowly disappearing? These people, who by heredity are fitted for the work, are swelling the ranks of the agricultural labourers, starving the land and overcrowding the fields. Why this? Because for many years you have been wearing foreign goods in preference to

home-made ones. It should not have wanted the Partition of Bengal to teach you to produce at home what you need. When you think of it, the Swadeshi movement has nothing to do with that. Whether Bengal has one Lieutenant-Governor, or two, may be a point of serious importance to the population over whom they rule. But the Partition of Bengal was not wanted to make the Swadeshi movement The Swadeshi movement was not born after the Partition. It has been going on for years and up and down the country, but the difficulty was that only a few people were in favour of it, and the great mass of the people were totally indifferent. One thing, of course, was that the foreign-made goods were cheaper, but also less durable. Assuming that they are cheaper, how stupid that they should be so! You grow cotton, you send the cotton to Lancashire, Lancashire spins and weaves it into cloths and sends them out here, and sells them cheaper than you can spin and weave your own cotton! There is something very badly managed in this, to say the least of it. If a thing can be sold more cheaply after paying all the freight to Lancashire and back, after paying high wages in England instead of small wages to Indian handloom weavers, it is certainly by some queer kind of upside-down management. I am not forgetting, of course, the unfair duties levied on Indian mills for the benefit of Lancashire, and other difficulties that occur to your minds. But they do not practically touch your village weaving industry at all. You should have gone on supporting the Indian weaver, working in his own village, and giving you lasting and well made cloths. If that had been done, the village weavers would have remained prosperous, and that prosperity would have reacted on the agriculturists and so with everything else. Fashion has been more powerful than patriotism. Now, thanks to the Partition of Bengal, poor

patriotism has a chance. But the present enthusiasm for Swadeshi goods will only be a flare like the blaze of twigs, easily lighted and quickly dying out, unless a principle underlies the movement and not a passing political irritation. No durable things are built on violent passion. Nature grows her plants in silence and in darkness, and only when they have become strong do they put their heads above the ground.

Now I am glad of all this excitement, for, as I said before, it generates steam. It has made the Swadeshi movement a far more living movement than it was. So I am very glad of it. I am glad to see all the froth and the bubble and the fuss. Some of them are very foolish, I admit, but still it means life instead of stagnation. What all good men should set their faces against is any attempt to put forcible pressure on people to do what others think that they ought to do. Wear Swadeshi clothes, as I have been urging you to do for years, but if your neighbour chooses to wear an English coat, argue with him, tell him it is unpatriotic, but do not tear it off his back. That sort of violence has ruined some good movements in England, and it is always wrong. None has the right to force other people to tread his own path against their will. Every man has a right to use, to follow, his own judgment. Convince him by argument and reasoning. Tell him that his conduct is unpatriotic, wrong and irrational; tell him he is making other countries rich while he starves his own. But do not carry on a mad crusade against everything English, especially with the help of the boys. Appeal to a man's brains. Surely there is argument enough: without home manufactures, there is no prosperity; without home manufactures, there are recurring famines; without home manufactures, there are

overcrowded, unproductive professions and undermanned industrial pursuits.

Every one of you can quietly, in his own town, go against the craze for foreign goods, and help forward Indian manufactures. It is so easy to do. Sometimes there is a little more trouble, I admit; sometimes I have had to wait patiently for four or five days, or even weeks, before I could get an Indian-made thing, when I could have got a foreign-made one in a moment; but if you cannot be patient for the sake of building up the industrial prosperity of your country, what a poor thing your patriotism must be. Help this movement in every way that you can, save by ways that are wrong; for remember that the Devas are behind all national policies, and therefore that the wrong way is always the long way, and useless.

Utilise the enthusiasm of the moment by turning it into wisely planned channels. Band yourselves together, for co-operation strengthens and helps enthusiasm. Use the crafts and products of this country in preference to others. But be a little patient. If you find that Government, which has been favourable to this movement, is now frowning on it in one part of the country, remember that, after all, that is quite natural under the conditions that have arisen. Governments are not perfect, any more than the governed. After all, Governments are only men, just as you are, with the same faults and the same short-sightedness. Therefore the Government should learn to be patient with the governed, and the governed with the Government. Now, in the past, Government has been favourable to the Swadeshi movement, and it will be so again. Naturally, for Government does not want famines in the land, it does not want the people to be poor, for, apart from all questions of humanity, if they are poor, they

cannot pay much in the way of taxes. It is to the advantage of Government that you should be rich; therefore it will help the movement again, when things are quieter; just now, it has been made into a political battle-cry, but that will pass. Politics are constantly changing, one burning question to-day and another to-morrow. Go on quietly and steadily without any fuss, building up your Indian manufactures, educating your sons. You think brains are wanted for pleading; much more are brains wanted for carrying on large agricultural and industrial concerns. We want the brightest brains for the building up of Indian industries at the present time. If an Indian Prince wants to have an electrical plant installed in his capital, he has to go to Europe to find an engineer who will set up for him his electrical machinery. That must be so until you educate your boys on the right lines. Educate them on all the lines of learning wanted to make a nation great. Get rid of the stupid idea that it is good, from the standpoint of class, to be a starving pleader, and bad to be a flourishing merchant. It is a mistake. A nation that goes that way goes down. It is a man's business to make his livelihood respectable, and respectability grows not out of the nature of the livelihood but out of the man. A man of high character, of noble ideal, of pure life, can make any calling respectable, and do not forget that a calling which helps national prosperity is more respectable than a calling which does not. That is a lesson that has to be learned in modern India.

Many resent the changes which are coming about, but although many of them be not along the lines of the ancient civilisation, yet, it must be remembered, that the spirit of this time, as much as that of any other, is the Divine Spirit. In whatever form it clothes itself, it is in the work of humanity to-day, as

it was in the work of humanity in the past, to help humanity onwards, or to make it step forward in the right way. But it is not the right way now to tread only in the footprints of the past, simply to re-introduce what has been. Your duty is to be inspired by the same spirit that made the past great, and in that spirit to shape the form suitable for the India of to-morrow.

Why should you be afraid to tread a new path? What is the creator of every form save the spirit? Why then be afraid to go on with the life, and to leave dead forms behind? And the strange thing is that often men cling most passionately to the forms which do not really belong to the life, but which are only excrescences which have happened to grow up round the living forms, as barnacles grow on a ship's bottom, and can be knocked off without harming the ship. There is one rule that helps us in distinguishing customs that are only barnacles from the vessel that carries the life. That is to be preserved which is ancient, according to the Shastras, and universal. But the things which are local, partial, modern, not according to the Shastras, these are the things which may indeed have been useful at the time of their formulation, but are now the useless and even mischievous barancles on the ship. Trust to life, to the living spirit. We were not there to guide the life, when it made the glorious past. Life can be trusted, for it is divinely guided, and all we have to do is to co-operate with it. That is the idea you must have above all things. Life is something greater than yourselves; you are only one tiny part of life, and the life makes its own forms. Study its tendencies and work with them, but it is life that builds, not men. Then you co-operate in the building of the forms, and if a form does not succeed it will be broken; and you should be

glad in the breaking of the useless form as you should be glad in the form that means success. Failure often means winning, and it needs dozens, nay hundreds, of attempts before the perfect masterpiece shines out in full. Trust life; that is the great lesson for these days of change, for change is coming, change from every side. Those changes that are good will endure, and you must be very patient while they are in the making. Be full of hope and full of courage.

All men die. You may say: Is that encouraging? Surely yes, for when a man dies, his blunders, which are of the form, all die with him, but the things in him that are part of the life never die, although the form be broken.

There is a new form to be built here, a form to be which has never yet been built, and that is India herself as one nation. As one nation, she exists in the world of spirit; as one nation, she exists in the world of mind. As one nation, she has never yet existed on the physical plane, but the day of her birth is near. Many States and Kings have been, many Maharajas, Rajas, and sometimes one Raja, great beyond his fellows, has held a wide imperial sway. But .ever yet has there been one India from North to South, from East to West. But she is coming. That one India, when she comes, will have her head crowned with the Himalayas, and her feet will be bathed in the waters that wash the shores of Tuticorin; she will stretch out her right hand to Burma and Assam, and her lefthand to Kathiawar and Baluchistan. That India has to be born. How? First, by believing in her with a strenuous faith, for faith is a mighty power; and then by thinking of her and aspiring after her as an ideal. For what a man thinks becomes actual in practice. And never yet was a nation born that did not begin in the

spirit, pass to the heart and the mind, and then take an outer form in the world of men. That India, the sound of her feet is on the mountains, and soon the rising eastern sun shall glow upon her forehead. Already she is born in the mind of men.

But let your thought for unity be potent and resolute; learn to drop sectarian divisions; learn to drop provincial divisions and animosities; leave off saying: "I am a Madrasi; I am a Punjabi; I am a Bengali; I am an up-country man"; leave all that behind and teach your boys and girls to say: "I am an Indian." Out of the mouths of the children thus speaking shall be born the India of to-morrow. Many religions will grow within her: not only her own parent religion, but others too will be woven into her being. Hindu and Mussalman must join hands, for both are Indians. Hindus, Mussalmans, Parsis, Christians, must join hands for all are Indians. In the India of the future, all men of every faith must join. If India is to be the spiritual light of the future, in her must be focused the light that comes from every faith, until in the prism of India they are all united into the one light which shall flood with sunlight the world, and all lights shall blend in the Divine Wisdom. That is our work. My Brothers, I am now talking to you, but this thing will not be made by talking. It is made by living. I would not dare to speak to you and offer you counsel if I did not strive to live that which I advise. Day by day, week by week, month by month, I strive to shape my life on the noble models which may serve the land, and in serving India will serve humanity; for greater than any land is humanity, and greater than any one people is the Race of whom all peoples are but branches; and if we have such hopes of future India, it is because we believe that her coming

will be a new light to the world. There was an old people in the ancient days, and not very ancient either, that was conquered, and apparently cast away. One person of that race cried, out: "If the fall of them be the riches of the world, what shall the receiving of them be but as life from the dead?" If India's humiliation has been, in a very real sense, the riches of the world—for this has been the means of spreading India's thoughts in the most widely-spoken tongue of the world, to the North and South, East and West, all round the habitable globe—what shall it be for humanity when India herself in her new glory is born into the world? India, from whose lips, in this land of the Rishis, came the religion that uplifts and spiritualises, the philosophy that illumines, and the science that trains; India, from whose mind, throughout the world of mind, came those great systems of thought which are now recognised as the noblest products of the human intellect; India, whose feet once passed through many States, and made every one of them fertile, prosperous, and wealthy; India, who was perfect in spirit and mind; when that India is born into the full vision of the eyes of men, perfect in body, is it too much to say that her coming will be as life from the dead? That is the glorious goal, for which we work; that is the splendid hope, that cheers our labour; that is the sublime aspiration, that rises perpetually to the ears of the Devas. For India's coming means the spiritualising of humanity; India's thinking means the lifting of thought on to a higher level; India's prosperity shall be the justification of religion, the justification of philosophy, as part of the life of a nation; and the world shall be redeemed from materialism because India is awake.

THE INDIAN NATION[1]

DEBATING Clubs among boys are very useful, not only as affording pleasant meetings and interesting discussions, but also as serving for training grounds for developing the knowledge and the qualities that are needed in public life. The discipline of mind and manners in such a club prepares the young debater for future service to his country, and accustoms him to the conditions under which much of his future work will be carried on. The rules which guide business meetings everywhere should be strictly followed in a Debating Club and should be regarded as aids to useful and expeditious discharge of business, and not as burdensome restrictions. To speak briefly, effectively, and to the point, to listen to an opponent's speech with patience, and to reply with courtesy, are lessons learned in the Club. Looking forward for a few years you will see yourselves called on to help in administrative work on Municipal and District Boards, and other public bodies. There you will utilise the training you are now passing through, and a man who knows what he wants to say, who can put his views clearly and briefly, who can argue with courtesy, and who abides by the rules of discussion, is one who becomes on all such bodies, a man of weight and usefulness. You should place before you such active partaking in public life as an honourable and

[1] An Address delivered to the Hindu College Boarders' Debating Club at the Anniversary Meeting of the C. H. C. Boarders' Debating Club.

legitimate object of ambition, for the happiness, prosperity and health of the community depend far more on good local administration than on big so-called political measures. The true patriot can do far more for India in these local bodies, than he can in the field of "big politics," and this work is political in the good old sense of the term; it is the politics of the community, and has far more bearing on the happiness of the community than the international relations discussed by statesmen. A people can prosper under a very bad government and suffer under a very good one, if in the first case the local administration is effective and in the second it is inefficient. Moreover, if a man wants to take a share in the chatter of Parliaments and the babel of party politics, he will be more useful and less mischievous if thoroughly well trained in local administration. Mr. Chamberlain was a Councillor and a Mayor of Birmingham before he became a Cabinet Minister; and Englishmen gain their knowledge of public business and their power of self-government by serving as honorary magistrates and local Councillors; by working on vestries, on municipalities, on boards of all kinds. Here is a line of public activity for you as patriots, in which your love of country can find legitimate and useful vent, in which you can devote your best energies to the public good.

Moreover in this, and in other college and school business you have to learn both liberty and responsibility; you elect officers, you make rules, you carry on your business. Now the sense of liberty is strong among you, and that is well. The sense of responsibility is weak, and that is not so well. The exercise of liberty and the feeling of responsibility must grow side by side, if your little community is to be prosperous and well organised. You must learn to

use your best thought in giving votes, to be moved by principles, not by passions. Free men who act recklessly and without a sense of responsibility destroy nations, they do not build them. You must learn tolerance, and understand that Truth is many-sided, and is never all with one man or one party. A man is fortunate if he sees one aspect of truth, and doubly fortunate, if through his opponents he can catch a glimpse of other aspects. In your debates and in your studies, when you read of other religions and other customs, never condemn hastily, or denounce views that you do not share. Quick condemnation of all that is not ours, of views with which we disagree, of ideas that do not attract us, is the sign of a narrow mind, of an uncultivated intelligence. Bigotry is always ignorant, and the wise boy, who will become the wise man, tries to understand and to see the truth in ideas with which he does not agree.

We have listened to two thoughtful papers on the bonds which should unite Hindus. The writer of one speaks of Hindus as part of a Nation, the other considers more the bonds which unite Hindus as a community within a Nation. Let us consider both.

A Common Religion must ever be the strongest bond of union among the Hindus as a community, and in order to make Hinduism a strong bond and not a disintegrating force, we must lay stress on what is ancient and universal, and ignore what is modern and local. The Sanatana Dharma Series will aid Hinduism as a unifying force, for it contains all that Hindus universally accept and leaves out sectarian beliefs. Every boy educated on these lines will be a link of union in the Hindu community, helping to hold it together, and as these teachings spread through the schools and colleges strong bonds of union will be forged.

A Common Language is a bond of union, and Sanskrit and English serve as common languages between Hindus of North and South, of East and West. The Hindus of the North and South chant the Mantras in Sanskrit, and discuss business and public questions in English. Therefore Sanskrit should be taught in every English Department, and English in every Pathashala.

Among the various vernaculars that are spoken in different parts of India there is one that stands out strongly from the rest, as that which is most widely known. It is Hindi. A man who knows Hindi can travel over India and find everywhere Hindi-speaking people. In the North it is the vernacular of a great part of the people and a large additional part, who do not speak Hindi, speak languages so closely allied to it that Hindi is acquired without difficulty. Urdu is but Persianised Hindi; Panjabi and Gurumukhi are dialects of Hindi; Gujerati and Marathi are again dialects of Hindi. Bengali is softer and more poetical Hindi. It is true that when we travel South we come to languages derived from a Dravidian source and not from Sanskrit, and here a real difficulty arises. But the South of India cannot afford to be cut off from the North, and the knowledge of Sanskrit in the South will make easy of acquirement its derivative Hindi, whereas Tamil and Telugu can never become universal in India. The learning of Hindi is a sacrifice that Southern India might well make to the unification of the Indian Nation. Then Sanskrit will bind Hindus together in religion. English in Imperial and official concerns, and Hindi in social and family life.

A Common Literature is another bond of union, and this all Hindus have in the Shruti, the Smriti, the Puranas, the Itihasa, the Philosophies and their commentaries, and the Drama.

This vast and splendid literature is the common heritage of all Hindus, of all sects, of all schools, and it forms one of the strongest bonds of union in the Hindu community.

A common religion, a common language, a common literature, such are the bonds of union among Hindus, as Hindus.

And now, what of Hindus as part of a people? What of the Indian Nation?

The Indian Nation of the future must combine into one coherent and organised body, men of various faiths and men of various races, who in the past have been bitter enemies, and have striven against each other for many generations. Hindus and Mussulmans, Parsis and Christians—to say nothing of such well marked inter-Hindu creeds as Jains and Sikhs—have to be welded into a Nation, and this, not by mergence of all the varying beliefs into one, which is impossible, but by the Theosophical recognition of the spiritual unity of all religions, and the broad-minded tolerance and mutual respect which grow out of this recognition. The warring races have to be welded into a Nation by turning the memories of strife into memories of common pride.

A common religion is not possible for India, but a recognition of a common basis for all religions, and the growth of a liberal, tolerant spirit in religious matters, are possible. It is this liberal, tolerant spirit which makes nationality possible in western countries. Christianity is divided into many more sects than is Hinduism, in addition to the deep lines of cleavage that divide Roman Catholics from Protestants. But these do not interfere with Patriotism. In England, France and Germany, large numbers of men are unbelievers, but they are none the less good patriots.

The bitter religious antagonisms of Italy have not prevented the building of united Italy. Nor need religious differences in India check the building of an Indian nation, if men of all creeds will sink their religious hatreds, and recognise that the God they all worship is the God of Humanity and not a tribal or national Deity.

But while a common religion is impossible, common languages and a common literature are possible. For the Muhammadan, Arabic will take the place of Sanskrit, but English is as necessary to him as to the Hindu, and Hindi is his Urdu, stripped of Persian derivatives and written in a different script. In literature he can as heartily enjoy Hindu masterpieces as the Hindu can delight in those born of Islam. Both belong to the Indian Nation, and form its common literature.

Geography has a determining influence on nationality for two nations cannot co-exist on the same soil. A nation must have its national territory, and we cannot have a Hindu nation and Mussulman nation in India; we must have one Indian Nation from the Himalayas to Cape Comorin, from Bengal to Kathiawar. Now such a Nation has never yet existed, and "India" always has been, and still is, a mere geographical expression. Old India was divided into many States large and small, and though occasionally in ancient days, an Emperor would be recognised and all the Kings become his Feudatories, such an Emperor ruled by force of his own great personality, and no one Empire endured and passed from Ruler to Ruler for generations. Hence India is yet to be made a living reality, an organised entity, and you, the students of to-day with tens of thousands of your like throughout the land, you are to be the builders of India, and from your hands she will emerge—a Nation. Let us look around and take lessons in nation-building, and

then you will see that turning Indian communities and races into a Nation is by no means an impossible thing.

There are three European Nations that may help us—the British, the German, the Italian, and the German most of all. Look at Great Britain. Her people are Kelts, Saxons, Danes, Normans, and their ancestors warred and slaughtered each other for centuries. Scotland and England were hereditary foes and a deep river of blood divided them more than the river Tweed. They were united under one crown just three hundred years ago, after sixteen hundred years of warfare, yet to-day, Englishmen are as proud of Bruce and Wallace as are Scotsmen, and Scotsmen are as proud of Chaucer and Shakespeare as are Englishmen, and both are equally lovers of Britain. Ireland is not yet fused into the Nation, for the grass is green over Emmett's grave only a century, and race and religion still divide. There the Nation still is building, is not yet built.

Italy has swiftly grown into a Nation, largely because of the magic of the great name of Rome and her old-world rule; she has become a Nation through the lifetime of many of us, and one of the memories of my childhood is the heroic figure of Garibaldi amid the surging, cheering crowds of London folk.

Germany has been made into a Nation before our very eyes, and is full of stirring national life and intense patriotic feeling, and Germany is specially instructive for us, because there we see two religions—one in name, but bitterly antagonistic in fact—facing each other, the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran, separated by memories of axe and fire, of cruelties more terrible than, and as recent as, the memories of hatred between Hindus and Mussulmans here. Yet now both Lutheran and Roman Catholics are brother

citizens of Empire, and are Germans above all. The German Nation is a fact, and it was born before our eyes.

How did Italy, how did Germany become Nations? By Sentiment. That may strike you as strange and yet it is not strange if you remember that thought is the one creative power. There was no Italy. There was no Germany. But poets sang of the Fatherland, authors wrote of the Fatherland, and at last they sang the Nation into birth, they sang the Dream into the Fact.

How shall the Indian Nation be born? By Sentiment also. A feeling is beginning to pervade her races that India is the Motherland, and the Indian Nation is already a Dream, an Ideal. She exists already in the world of Ideas; she will pass, she is passing, into the world of discussion; and thence she will be born into the world of Facts. This is the Law. This is the Path. First the Idea, then the Popularisation, then the Fact.

How shall we smooth the path for her coming feet? We must make the history of India a common history, looking on all her great men as a common glory, on all her heroes as a common heritage. Hindus must learn to be proud of Akbar, Mussulmans of Shivaji. The history must lose its bitterness as of foe against foe, and become the story of the common Motherland in the making, all parties contributing to the enrichment, and sharing in the results. The sense of having been conquered in a battle must pass, and the battle be regarded merely as an event that went to the shaping of the Nation. Courage, vigour, strength, virility, these are the sweet fruit of war, grievous and terrible in the sowing; and these remain alike to conquerors and to conquered, when once the sense of personal triumph has faded out of the one, and that of personal

loss out of the other. Ours is the task, so to teach history as to show the use of the struggles in India, as to eradicate proud and injured feeling. Thus shall separateness and hatred pass, and patriotism and love grow up. As boys struggle hard in a match, one side against the other, and afterwards forget the struggle and the bruises received, and use the strength and skill thus obtained in the team which represents the whole College, so must Indians forget the antagonism of the war games of the past, and let the wounds be only honourable scars, while they use their strength and skill for the Nation.

It may be said: "But if this is so, why not educate together the boys of different faiths, why have a Hindu College at Benares, a Muslim College at Aligarh?" Because, such separate education is the best for building a religious and a moral character, and such characters, once moulded, will live together in peace and mutual respect in manhood. During the plastic years of boyhood it is best to mould and shape the character after its own type, to make the Mussulman boy a good Mussulman, the Hindu boy a good Hindu. When they are firm in their respective religions, they can mix together as men, and gain, not lose by the contact. Only they must be taught a broad and liberal tolerance as well as an enlightened love for their own religion, so that each may remain Hindu or Mussulman, but both be Indians.

Just as stones are shaped and fitted, and then built into their respective places in an edifice, so must these boys be shaped and fitted by their several religions to be built into the Indian Nation. Let us, then, hold up as an Ideal the Indian Motherland, the Indian Nation; let us popularise the Idea, till the heart of each Province throbs in unison; then let her descend into the world of Facts; let the Indian Nation be born.

INDIA, HER PAST AND HER FUTURE[1]

Never, I think, since I began to lecture many years ago, have I felt, in standing on a platform, more of difficulty than I feel to-night—difficulty, because I doubt how far I can win your interest, and still more I doubt how far I can win your sympathy. For India, as you look at it and as I look at it, has a very distinctly dual aspect. Your India and mine are probably very divergent. You know her as she is to-day after eight centuries of conquest and degradation. You know her, many of you, by taking part in the foreign government by which she is subjugated, and therefore you are very largely shut out from the real thought and the real life of the people. Whereas to me she is in very truth the Holy Land, the land whose great philosophy has been the source of all the philosophies of the Western world, the land whose great religion has been the origin of all religions, the mother of spirituality, the cradle of civilisation. When I think of India, I think of her in the greatness of her past, not in the degradation of her present. For to-day but few of her children know anything of her great philosophy. To the mass of her people her mighty religion is veiled, becoming to the ignorant many a superstition, to the cultivated few but a poetical allegory. No longer the very life of the people, it is a form rather than a spirit. And so India fallen is the India of the present, while the India to which I

[1] A lecture delivered on board the *Kaisar-i-Hind*, in the Indian Ocean, November 6th, 1893, and published in *Lucifer*, 1894.

would win your thoughts to-night is India unfallen, India as she was in her past, as she shall be in her future—mother once more in days to come, as in the days behind us, of art and of knowledge, mother of spiritual life and of true religion. That is the India I know; that is the India which has given to us the literature that I am going to say something of to-night; the India whose polity was built by King-Initiates, whose religion was moulded by divine men; the India which even so late as five-thousand years ago felt her fields trodden by the feet of Shri Krishna, which even twenty-four centuries ago heard her cities echoing with the sublime morality of the Buddha; the India which later, when her great wars were over, had her poets who in the *Mahabharata* and in the *Ramayana* gave epic poetry to the world greater than that of Greece; dramatists who in later times still left treasures of beauty that the learned in the West are just beginning to appreciate. That is the India of which I have to speak—the India which, as I said, is to me the Holy Land. For those who, though born for this life in a Western land and clad in a Western body, can yet look back to earlier incarnations in which they drank the milk of spiritual wisdom from the breast of their true mother, they must feel ever the magic of her immemorial past, must dwell ever under the spell of her deathless fascination; for they are bound to India by all the sacred memories of their past; and with her, too, are bound up all the radiant hopes of their future, a future which they know they will share with her who is their true mother in the soul-life.

Though that may seem to many of you an extravagant view of India, still, to some who by no means share my faith in her philosophy and in her religion there has been a great fascination in Indian thought. Take the testimony of Max Müller given

not long ago in one of his lectures in Glasgow or Edinburgh (I forget which), in which he said that India with her civilisation was unique, as was her literature, in the history of the world, and the uniqueness lay in this—I am only roughly quoting what he said—that there once, and only once, you had a whole nation bent on the search for spiritual truth; that there from one end of the land to the other the people sought and honoured spiritual wisdom; so that the man who made any great discovery in truth had the highest title to honour, and kings would leave their thrones to visit the mud hut of some ascetic, because he had found out some truth about the soul, and was willing to teach it to whoever should come as a worthy pupil. Even there you see how something of what I have called the deathless fascination of India has been felt. Even Western Orientalists also admit the uniqueness of her power and the uniqueness of her position in the world.

The India to which this thought really applies is the region which lies between the Himalayas and the Vindhya Mountains, and between the eastern and western oceans. I give these as limits laid down by Manu as those of the true Aryavarta, the land of the Aryas, or Aryans. That, then, the north and the north-west, is what we may call the religious and heroic India. There was settled the great race called the Aryan or the noble. If you want their type you may find it almost pure, in fact quite pure in a few cases, in some of the great Brahmana families of India, the noblest physical, mental and spiritual type which the earth has produced. This race, settled in that land, had for its teachers men who in past ages had fin shed their spiritual evolution, and who came to the infant race as its instructors in civilisation, came as the inspirers of its earliest literature, as the builders of

its religion, and so moulded this people dwelling in the great plains of the Ganges, in this ever-sacred land. From them came the mighty literature of which only a few fragments remain to-day; for the Vedas of that time and the Upanishads of that time are not the Vedas and the Upanishads that we have to-day. Noble as these are, they are but the fragments of the ancient literature, fragments left for the Indian people when they were entering on their dark age, as being as much of spiritual truth as they were able to understand, while the others were withdrawn, to be kept for better times, a far more spiritual race. And then there were built up in this north and north-western part of what we now call India, a polity, a religion, a social life, a general national condition of which the results were that unique civilisation of which Max Müller spoke. Its uniqueness consisted in the fact that it was all framed for a spiritual purpose, planned to assist spiritual evolution. The State was framed to a spiritual end; the family was built on a spiritual basis, the whole daily life was moulded to conduce to spiritual progress. So that even to-day it is easy in India to be religious at least on the outside, and the Hindu has ready to his hand the forms in which spiritual life may show itself; once more to quote Max Müller, he eats religion, drinks religion, sleeps religion, and breathes religion—a statement which is perfectly true, as you may see for yourselves, if you once get hold of the meaning of his religious ceremonies and mark the way in which those ceremonies are woven into his daily life.

The polity was the polity of caste—not of caste as you have it to-day in endless subdivisions, but of the four great castes into which, after all, if you think of it, all human forms of life must throw themselves.

There were first the Brahmans, the spiritual caste, the teachers of the young, the teachers of the people in the spiritual life, the students, the priests, the literary class—the class, that is, that includes the great intellectual professions as well as the spiritual order, and consists of those who are naturally, by their intellectual and spiritual qualities, fitted to be the guides and teachers of the people. Then after them the Kshattriyas, the warrior caste, the royal and ruler class, the class that administered justice, that saw to the administration of the State, that defended it from internal disturbance as well as against foreign aggression. Then the Vaishyas, the merchant caste, that included all the commercial and trading classes and the agriculturists. And lastly, the Shudras, or the serving caste. Those four castes are those which were originally instituted and those which still remain, though masked by the innumerable sub-castes. They have given stability to Indian life; they have preserved her civilisation despite all kinds of conquest and of degradation. And if India has not disappeared as Assyria, as Egypt, as Chaldæa have disappeared—all of them with civilisations younger than her own—it is largely because of the stability given to her national existence by this system founded on natural divisions and with the stability of all natural things. And, mind you, the Indian standpoint from which caste is seen is very different from the standpoint that you may take in the West. Looking at this life as the one life which a man has, it may seem to you hard that he should be born into a caste in which he remains all his life with but rare exceptions. But where people know that they are incarnated time after time, that the soul has to be trained in every department of life, then it seems helpful as well as natural that these four castes should exist, as the four great schools of the evolving

soul, and that the Brahman caste, pure in its blood, developing the most delicate organism, the subtlest brain, the most perfect mental mechanism, should be inhabited by the most advanced souls. And so in gradation with the other castes in the land.

The social life was similarly organised, always for a spiritual end. Take the institution of marriage as you find it in the early Indian books and amongst the early Aryan people. You find there side by side husband and wife, united in all the greatest things of life: the man, the priest of his household, the wife the priestess without whom the daily sacrifices could not be performed, and therefore without whom the duties of the household could not be carried on; for the sacred household fire was only kindled by the bride and bridegroom, and without this there was no "household". Husband and wife not only married in life, but through death to the world beyond. According to Manu:

> Let mutual fidelity continue until death; this may be considered as the summary of the highest law for husband and wife;

for

> The husband receives his wife from the gods (he does not wed her) according to his own will.[1]

In such households grew up the heroic women who stand out for all time from Sanskrit literature—women great not only in the home but also in spiritual knowledge; such as Maitreyi, who "was fond of discussing the nature of Brahma".[2] Again, in an assembly of Brahmans you may read how

[1] *Manu*, ix. 101 and 95.
[2] *Brihad Aranyaka-Upanishad*, V. iv. 1.

Gargi, a woman, got up and put questions to Yajnavalkya which that learned teacher answered with full care and respect.[1] What Hindu can there be who does not feel his heart swell with pride when he thinks of those women, or of women like Sita, Savitri and Sakuntala? And what Hindu does not feel his heart shrink with pain when he contrasts those heroic figures with the women of to-day, sweet and pure and devoted as they are by the million, but still half children, encaged in the prison of the zenana and the still worse prison of the ignorance in which they dwell? Then take not only this its polity and its social life, but also its religious ceremonies; every act of life a religious service; the very food that was cooked, cooked ever as an offering to the Gods, and only secondarily as food for man;[2] hence very largely, let me say in passing, the abstemiousness of the Hindu nation, all the life of which was to be founded on a spiritual ideal, and not on that of material luxury.

Then, five thousand years ago, came the beginning of the end, the opening of the Kali Yuga, the dark age, the time at which Shri Krishna appeared, the last of the great incarnations of Vishnu. Then coming on from that time downwards you have the time I alluded to of the great poets, those who wrote the *Mahabharata* and the *Ramayana*, and so on. Then you have the coming of the Buddha and the founding of exoteric Buddhism, the teaching of a religion which, while it has a metaphysical and philosophical side, is, looked at in its exoteric aspect, to a very great extent materialistic, and in which, as a matter of fact, it was hoped to preserve at least morality through the Kali Yuga, if spirituality could scarcely

[1] *Ibid.*, III. vi. and viii.
[2] *Bhagavad-Gita*, III. 12, 13.

be kept alive. So down these ages of the descending cycle lower and lower the people sank, until at last the spiritual life has well nigh disappeared. The Brahmana caste, no longer the custodians of knowledge for the teaching of the people, became its jailers rather than its stewards, using it for their own glory and not for the feeding of the people with spiritual food. Then century after century down to the Christian era, with still some exquisite poets, and still downwards after it, becoming more and more silent, until the twelfth, when the Muhammadan invasion swept over the land that has forfeited her birthright, and stifled, as it were, the last breathings of her past. Since then India has had no history. Since then India has been sleeping. Since then she has taken on many and many of the customs of her conquerors, and lately the veneer of a western and materialistic civilisation has done even more harm to her people than much of the Muhammadan conquest did, for it has touched what was left of the inner as well as the outer life. Sleeping she is, and sleeping she will remain, until she turns back to that which inspired the literature of her past, to the philosophy and the religion of her greater days. Those only have in them the hope of her future, as they have in them the essence of her past. That is the hope for India that still burns hidden in some few faithful hearts, that hope of the reawakening of India for which some still work and pray.

Turning to what India has given to the world, we find that the literature that was left, as I have described, at the beginning of the Kali Yuga, is the literature that contains the ideas on which was based all the great non-materialistic philosophy of Greece; on these ideas Plato—and Emerson said that all the greatest thinkers of the world since his time were

Plato's men—founded all his teaching; these, after giving philosophy to the West through Greece, were revived once more, in their Pythagorean form especially, in the Middle Ages, by Giordano Bruno, who sounded the note which awoke Europe from its fifteen centuries of slumber and made modern life and modern science a possibility. Then onward from the time of Bruno to our own day you find them constantly reappearing, until in the nineteenth century, in men like Schopenhauer, some of the thoughts of the Upanishads are distinctly formulated—Schopenhauer who found in these works his noblest inspiration, and who brought into the life of German philosophy the ever-young philosophy of the East.

And it is to this that I now propose to turn. With this rough sketch of the fashion in which India was built, in which India lived, in which India fell, I come to the literature which is still her claim to the world's consideration, literature written in the most perfect of languages and enshrining the sublimest of thoughts.

First the Veda, a word which simply means knowledge, a word which covers that which to us to-day is the most ancient literature of India, threefold in its divisions however looked at; it is threefold as Rik, Yajur and Sama, but it is from another standpoint that I desire to put it to you. The Veda, thus looked at, consists first of what are called Mantras or songs, hymns to the Gods, hymns used in religious ceremonies, hymns which are known by heart to the Brahmans as officiating priests, and used whether in the domestic or the public ceremonies in which the Gods are worshipped. Then, secondly, the Brahmanas, which contain the ceremonies and rites of the religion, not so interesting save to those who under the symbolism can reach the hidden truths. And, most

important to us, thirdly, the Upanishads—the esoteric knowledge of the East in so far as that inner teaching was committed to writing at all—which have raised so much enthusiasm in the Western world because of their deep philosophy; books that must always be books for the few, which can never become popular amongst the many, until the race is far more evolved than it is at present. The existence of these Upanishads—of which, as you may read in one of them, it is said that Brahma "is concealed in the Upanishads that are concealed in the Vedas" [1] —made necessary that Indian institution of the Guru, which is so little understood, and which has become, alas! so much of a form instead of a reality. The Guru, in the old sense of the word, was the spiritual teacher who knew the inner meaning of the scriptures, that which was never committed to writing at all, which was simply given face to face, mouth to mouth, as it was called, handed down from Guru to chela or disciple, the disciple in his turn becoming a Guru and handing on to other disciples the sacred truth that he had been taught. The Guru still exists in modern India, but simply as an ordinary religious teacher, to whom the lad is sent for so many years of his life to learn the Vedas and the Upanishads. They have lost the esoteric teaching so far as the majority of them are concerned; a few, indeed, preserve it still, but they are "hard to find".

This division of exoteric and esoteric has had a great deal of criticism thrown upon it in the West. It is said that truth should be sown broadcast, and that there ought not to be anything which is kept back. But is not that, after all, folly? As a dry matter of fact, you cannot give to a person that which he cannot take, which he is unable to under-

[1] *Shvetashvatara*, V. 6.

stand or to assimilate. It has been the great fault of the popular religion of the West that it has divorced itself so much from philosophy and from science; and the result is that educated people are slipping away from it just because it does not dominate their intellect as well as satisfy their heart. It is all very well to say that a religion should be such that the poorest of the people can grasp it. But that which is truth for the uneducated ploughman is not truth for the educated philosopher. And it is well that we should understand that the old division is wise enough, that it is well to have a philosophy of religion as well as an ethic of religion that a child is able to grasp. The ethical religion will be the guide of the many; the philosophical will be the priceless treasure of the few; but the philosophy will be the heart of the religion, and will make it impregnable against all intellectual assaults. This, then, is the part played by the Upanishads in the religious history of India. The sacred books like the Puranas are for the multitude, and are often full of stories of exquisite moral beauty, useful as exemplifying heroic virtues and for training the people to admire a high standard of morality. But the philosophy is that of the Upanishads, and it is there that we must seek for the great value of India to the world. The Guru was not only to fully teach the philosophy; it was also his duty to show the student how he might attain to the knowledge of the Supreme by the use of certain means. This was Yoga—which means union—the method whereby the esoteric truth was rendered practically useful and developed the spiritual nature. It was not sufficient to appeal to the intellect; it was not sufficient that the mind should be instructed. It was necessary also to develop the soul and spirit in man, and Yoga was the means whereby these were to be developed. That was the work of the Guru—to

teach the student how he might develop his inner nature, how the spiritual nature might become active and dominate both the physical and the intellectual. There was the Yoga of action, that which men in the world might follow, doing all action with a religious motive, and without attachment to its results, so gradually becoming fit for the higher Yoga of meditation and contemplation. Of these you may read, if you will, the details in the *Bhagavad-Gita*,[1] where Shri Krishna instructed his disciple Arjuna, and through him many another in the generations that follow.

The basis of the philosophy of the Upanishads is the ONE, unnameable, incommensurable, incomprehensible, That which lies at the root of all existence, and without which existence could not be. That is the nameless; Parabrahman it is called, that is, simply, beyond Brahman, Brahman being the name by which in much of this literature the supreme God in manifestation is known. But behind all manifested Gods, behind the God that is the maker of the universe, behind the supreme God that reveals himself to the spirit of man, there is this boundless, infinite, eternal, unnameable One, the permanence of which must be posited to explain the transient, but which, being unmanifested, we, the manifested, the corporeal, are unable to understand or to reach. Then from That emanated the cause of all, that which in its second outward stage is the Logos of the Greek philosophy, and which you find as the "Word" in the fourth Christian Gospel, "the Word" that "was with God and was God"; in the Hindu philosophy this is Brahman, from whom all worlds proceed; not directly, but through many emanating

[1] See Chaps. iii, v, vi more especially, but the dialogue constantly returns to these two forms of Yoga.

intelligences. So that this world of ours in its definite creation is made by a lower God than Brahman, *i.e.*, by Brahma, male and female, the source of living things.

> Brahma, the creator of the universe, the preserver of the world, was first produced among the Gods.[1]

But it is the Supreme, the Father of spirits, that is the true goal of man, that is the object that he is to seek. It is the "Science of Brahman" that in all the Upanishads is held up as that after which man is to pursue. We are told that:

> He is the invisible, unseizable being, without origin, without distinction, without eye or ear, without hand or foot, the eternal, pervading, omnipresent, subtle, inexhaustible being, whom the sages behold as the source of the elements. As the spider casts out and draws in [its web], as on the earth the annual herbs are produced, as from living man the hairs of the head and body spring forth, so is produced the universe from the indestructible [Brahman].[2]

However many the Gods in name, they are all one in their essence, all one because they are all but forces and names, forms and entities in whom the One is manifested. Thus it is said that they who spoke the word:

> Sacrifice to this, hence sacrifice to the one or the other God is not proper. He is verily this creation; for he verily is all the Gods, call him Indra, Mittra, Varuna, and Agni.

And another passage:

> He who is Brahman, who is Indra and Prajapati, is all these Gods.[3]

[1] *Mundaka*, i. I.
[2] *Mundaka*, i. 6, 7.
[3] *Brihad Āranyaka*, I. iv.

Brahman, the supreme God, as I said, is put forward as man's aim. Man is told to seek after this God, to endeavour to become one with Him.

> Manifest, near, dwelling verily in the cave is the great goal; on him is founded all that moves, breathes, and closes the eyes. . . . This is true, this is immortal, this, O gentle one, know as [the aim] to be pierced. Seizing as his bow the great weapon of the Upanishad, put the arrow sharpened by devotion . . . know, O beloved, that indestructible as the aim. The sacred word is called the bow, the soul the arrow, and Brahman its aim; he shall be pierced by him whose attention does not swerve. Then he will be of the same nature with him, as the arrow [becomes one with the target when it has pierced it].[1]

But that great God, the supreme, how shall he be attained? He can be attained by man because the essence of man is one with his own. Says another Upanishad:

> As from a blazing fire in thousand ways similar sparks proceed, so, O beloved, are produced living souls of various kinds from the indestructible [Brahman].[2]

They are the one Brahman, the one essence. That which is the central fire can be found again by its sparks, and the spirit that dwells in man in the ether of the heart, as it is called, in the cave of the heart, that spirit being itself one with Brahman may be found by man in whom it dwells And so the supreme may be attained. The Upanishads weary themselves with efforts to describe how this God may be sought after, how he may be recognised, how he may be found.

> Whoever knows him . . . ["the blessed God" it is said] who, concealed in all beings, is the Lord of the

[1] *Mundaka*, II. ii. 1-4.
[2] *Ibid.*, II. i. 1.

universe . . . cuts the bonds of death. . . . That God whose work is the universe, that supreme soul, who is always dwelling in the hearts of beings, is revealed by the heart, discernment and mind. Those who know him become immortal. . . . For him whose name is infinite glory there is no likeness. Not in the sight abides his form, none beholds him by the eye. Those who know him dwelling in the heart, by the heart and mind, become immortal.[1]

So again, earlier in the same Upanishad, we learn that:

The ruler [the supreme soul] upholds this universe, but the soul which is not the ruler is enchained by the condition of an enjoyer; when it knows God it is liberated from all bonds. They are all-wise the one and ignorant the other, both unborn; omnipotent the one, without power the other. . . . When a person knows this Brahman . . . [then he becomes liberated].[2]

In prayer this was constantly made the very centre of the prayer; thus in a prayer to the supreme soul come the words: "That same soul am I." So the student is told constantly, "Thou art That," "Thou art Brahman," "Thou art one with the Supreme." And so, wherever we read, this, the One, is that which is to be sought for, and in that it is in man's heart he is able to discover it—to discover it by meditation, by effort, by the conquering of desire. We are further told that this One is

The life of life . . .[3] this great unborn soul is the same which abides as the intelligent soul in all living creatures. . . . Unseen he sees, unheard he hears, unminded he minds, unknown he knows. There is none that sees but he; there is none that hears but he, there

[1] *Shvetāshvatara*, iv. 15,17,19, 20
[2] *Ibid.* i. 8, 9.

is none that minds but he; there is none that knows but he, he is thy soul, the inner ruler, immortal. Whatever is different from him is perishable. [1]

But they never sought to prove the existence of the supreme soul. That which "cannot be proved" [2] was one of its names. For this supreme soul was not to be found by argument, not by intellectual discussion, not by any effort of the mind. Its "only proof," it is said, "is the belief in the soul," [3] for only the soul could know its own kindred; and the belief in man's soul is the one proof of the reality of God. Is not that true in every faith? Is not that the inner witness that you find in every scripture, no matter what the scripture may be? Not by ratiocination can Deity be discovered. Man knows him only through the soul because the soul is one with him.

Embodied the soul lives, and so the body was called "the divine town of Brahman," [4] that in which he dwelt; and the heart, the "ether of the heart" was the supreme centre, the "cave". So we may read of the embodied soul, the soul "embodied in the town of nine gates," [5] the body with its nine openings, is that which gains experience, and that which, taking on the body, learns by that body the nature of itself and of its God. Thus it was that might be known the God that was without commencement, known in the soul by the soul; thus he could be sought after by the corporeal being as the cause of existence and non-existence, man within himself finding the divine. But only in one way. By conquest of the lower nature, by the conquest of

[1] *Brihad Aranyaka*, IV iv. 18,22, and III. vii. 23.
[2] *Ibid.* IV. iv. 20.
[3] *Māndūkya*, 7.
[4] *Mundaka*, II. ii. 7.
[5] *Shvetashvatara*, iii. 18.

the senses, and also by conquest of the mind. For the mind is only a lower manifestation, and he who would know the innermost must go beyond the mind as well as beyond the senses. And so in the *Katha-Upanishad* we may read :

> The soul which is subtler than the subtle, greater than what is great, is seated in the cavity of the living being. He who is free from desire and without grief, beholds by the tranquillity of the senses that majesty of the soul. . . . The soul cannot be gained by knowledge, not by understanding, not by manifold science. It can be obtained by the soul by which it is desired. His soul reveals its own truth. [1]

Conquest, then, of the senses, conquest of the mind, conquest of every desire, so that the man might live free in the body, and, free, might know the truth. The highest state of the soul was that of Brahman.

When the senses were subdued, when the mind was conquered, when the very soul itself was tranquil, then the fourth state of the soul, that of spirit, was reached, and the man became one with God.[2] This to the Hindu was immortality. He did not look upon it as immortality to pass out of the body at the gate of death, returning again to earth to live another life. He only regarded immortality as won when the wheel of births and deaths had ceased to turn; and then he passed into the condition of the supreme spirit. Immortality gained in this fashion could only be won by those who went beyond the sense of separateness, who had conquered all idea that they were different to this supreme soul; then they were

[1] *Katha*, ii. 20, 23.
[2] *Māndūkya*, 7.

no longer born, then they no longer came back to earth.

> Thus knowing him, a person overcomes death; there is no other way for obtaining liberation.[1]

In the heart of all whose bonds are broken in this life, in that heart only immortality is obtained.[2] For according to this teaching reincarnation was the fashion in which the soul gained its knowledge, living from life to life. And so, again, we may read the passage:

> As a goldsmith, taking a piece of gold, forms another shape which is more new and agreeable, so throwing off this body and obtaining knowledge, the soul forms a shape which is more new and agreeable. . . . This soul. . . becomes as are its works and conduct. He whose works are good becomes good; he whose works are evil becomes evil. By holy works one becomes holy, by evil works evil. Likewise others [say] this Purusha has the nature of desire. As his desire so is his resolve, as is his resolve so is his work, as his work so is his reward. . . Having arrived at the last effect of the work which he here performs, he comes from this world again to this world in consequence of [his work].[3]

Thus he comes from life to life:

> In this wheel of Brahman, which is the support as well as the end of all beings, which is infinite, roams about the pilgrim soul, when it fancies itself and the ruler different. . . As by the use of food and drink the body grows, so the individual soul by volition, touch, sight and delusion assumes successively forms in accordance with its action in the various places. The individual soul assumes by its qualities manifold gross or subtle

[1] *Shveṭāshvaṭara*, iii. 8.
[2] *Katha*, vi. 15.
[3] *Brihad Āranyaka*, IV. iv. 4-6.

forms. . . . He proceeds from birth to birth by his actions.[1]

As desire draws it back to earth, only by the killing out of desires can it become free:

The wise who, free from desires, adore the man, will not be born again. Whoever fancying forms desires, is by his desires born here and there.[2]

When all the desires cease which were cherished in his heart, then the mortal becomes immortal, then he obtains here Brahman.[3]

Whoever knows the God who is without commencement, without end. . . . becomes liberated from all bonds. Those who know the God. . . relinquish their bodies.[4]

For man, as is taught in another Upanishad, becomes what he reflects.

Man is a creature of reflection; whatever he reflects upon in this life, he becomes the same hereafter.

"Therefore," it finishes up practically: "Therefore, should he reflect on Brahman."

Since we change into the likeness of our thought, since we fashion our future by our present desires, we should reflect on the highest, we should think of the greatest, and then we shall become what we reflect. To know Brahman is to be free. This is the "Secret of Death". Some of you may have read Sir Edwin Arnold's translation of one of the most exquisite of the Upanishads under this title, "The Secret of Death". A man is offering all he has to the Gods. His son, looking at the sacrifice, thinks that

[1] *Shvetáshvatara*, i. 6, and v. 11, 12 and 7.
[2] *Mundaka*, III. ii. 1, 2.
[3] *Katha*, vi. 14.
[4] *Shvetáshvatara*, v. 13, 14.

the all of the father is but poor and inadequate, and he offers himself in order that the sacrifice may be made complete, and the father gives him to Death. Going to the house of Death he there meets Yama, the king, the lord of Death, and Yama, because he, a Brahman youth, had remained unwelcomed in his house three days and nights, gives him three boons that he may choose. He chooses for the first that his father may meet him with mind and affection at peace when he is free again from death. That is granted. He chooses as his second the secret of the heavenly fire. That is granted. Then he asks as a third boon: "Does the soul live after death, or does it perish?" "Ask me anything but that," pleads Death; and he offers him all enjoyments, the wealth and position of a king, spirits from heaven to be his servants, sons and grandsons who shall live hundreds of years, and everything else the heart of man could desire. But the lad will have none of them, for they are all under the power of death. The sons will die, wealth will fade away, life will perish; nothing but this knowledge about the soul will he have for his third boon. At last Death, overcome by his persistency, obliged to keep his word and to give that to which he is pledged, tells the secret of death, that which is the following of the spiritual life, that which is this true goal of man which I have mentioned. He tells him to know the embodied soul

As the rider, the body as the car, know intellect as the charioteer, and mind again as the reins. They say the senses are the horses, and their objects are the roads. . . . Whoever is unwise, with reins never applied, has the senses unsubdued, like wicked horses of the charioteer. But whosoever is wise, with the mind always applied, has the senses subdued like good horses of the charioteer. . . . The man whose charioteer is wise, the reins of whose mind are well

applied, obtains the goal of the road, the highest place of Vishnu. Higher indeed than the senses are their objects, higher than their objects is the mind [Manas], intellect [Buddhi] higher than the mind, higher than intellect the great soul [Atma Mahan]. Higher than the great one the unmanifested [Avyaktam], higher than the unmanifested is Purusha, higher than Purusha is That; this the limit, the highest road. Being the hidden nature of all beings, it is not manifested; but it is beheld by the attentive, subtle intellect of men of subtle sight. Let the wise subdue his speech by mind, subdue his mind by that nature which is knowledge, subdue his knowledge in the great soul. . . . Whoever has understood [the nature] of Brahman escapes the mouth of Death.[1]

That was the final secret of Death.

Out of this, then, it was that the civilisation of India grew; out of that sublime teaching the greatness of her past was evolved. It was when her people thus believed that India was great; it was that which not only made their civilisation and moulded their polity, but that also which brought back the soul time after time to the same land, evolving time after time in the same race. That was the strength of their Brahmans while the Brahmans were the teachers of her people; that was the spiritual food which made her the mother of nations, which made her the cradle of the religions of the world.

This lost, came her degradation. The language of the Gods became a dead language, known only to the few. This literature passed out of the life of her people, and they grew downwards towards the lower philosophy and the lower faith they hold. And when we look to her future it is in the inspiration of the past that we must seek it. For when her Brahmans once more take their place as the guides and the teachers of the people; when they no longer

[1] *Katha*, I. iii. 3-6, 9-13, 15.

keep this knowledge for self, but spread it abroad everywhere; when once more in every Indian household are heard the teachings of the Vedas and the Upanishads; when once more in every Indian household is understood the true meaning of the hymns and of the worship of the Supreme in the hands of the father and the mother of the household—then India will begin to wake from the sleep of centuries, and once more to hold up her head amongst the nations of the world. Her civilisation—and this is significant—has lasted. None other has lasted, old as hers is old. She is the most ancient of all the Aryan peoples, the mother of all the sub-races of the Aryan nations. She was old when ancient Egypt was young; very old when Assyria and Chaldæa were born. They have passed away and have left no traces save in their pottery and in their ruins. But India is still a people despite the divisions that degrade her, despite the quarrels that deny the brotherhood of her sons; and she remains with the possibility of a nation because of her past, and because even in her present the ancient form remains. Those ceremonies that to you seem often so childish, those superstitions that to you may seem so degrading, have still in them the possibility of the revival of spiritual life. They are still the form into which the spirit may again be poured. If her vessels were broken, then the water of life would be spilt in the pouring; the vessels are there, polluted and defiled as they are; they can be cleansed, and the water of spiritual life can still be held in them, ay, and shall be held in them in the days to come.

In the hearts of a few amongst her people, a few amongst her Brahmans, this hope is softly thrilling at the present hour. They are but few, very, very few, known within a very small circle. Their hope

is of the future and not of to-day They take part in no political controversies; they take part in none of the competitions for place and for money; they care not for Western titles, they care not for Western privilege nor Western honours; their heart is in the past and in the future, and they are living for that future to-day. Amongst the young men of India here and there they find a pupil whose heart they fire with the same flame of love and of longing that burns within their own. For India's future lies not in political ambition; India's future lies not in political greatness; India's future is as a spiritual nation, as the teacher of the world in spiritual truth. Even to-day she stands as a witness against materialism, even to-day amongst the thousands of her Yogis—superstitious, degraded and polluted as too many of them are—even still they seek that which is not of the senses, still they seek that which is not of worldly gain. However much you may think them fanatical, you must, at least, admit that they have an aim beyond that of the body. And even in their degradation they stand against that worse degradation which would blot out man's spirit and man's soul, would degrade him to the animal to which he is only allied in his form.

And so, looking forward and hoping, we see her awaking from the sleep of centuries, taking up again her ancient faith, taking up again her ancient religion, her ancient philosophy, her ancient literature; taking up again her place as evolver of the inner man, as teacher of the possibilities of the human soul, as leader of the way towards union with the higher nature, and, therefore, towards the higher and grander race that in days to come shall tread upon our earth. For the future is not with the things of the body; it is with the things of the soul. The body perishes, but the soul is immortal. Civilisations

rise and fall, but the spirit of man endureth for ever. Like that from which it springs, it is indivisible and immortal, unborn and undying, taking body after body as a garment and throwing them aside when they are worn and done with. That is the mission of India to the world, that teaching is the claim of India to the love and to the homage of mankind. And the day shall surely come when sleeping India shall awake and rise again amongst the people, and rise, not to lead them along the road of material domination, but along the road of spiritual triumph to union at last with the supreme goal.

INDIAN EMIGRATION AND TRADE UNIONISM[1]

In discussing the Labour Question in England, I have often referred to the necessity of Trade Unionism for the protection of English Labour. Nothing but collective bargaining with the capitalist can save the man whose only possession is his labour from being pressed down to the lowest level of wage which can support life. "Free Competition in the Labour Market" is a fine phrase for the enslavement of the labourer, and the Englishman, shrewd and enduring, well understands this fundamental fact. No sophistry, however thickly gilded with the dear name of Liberty, can persuade him that he can compete freely with the man who holds his life in his grip. He starves while others chatter, and the starvation he endures is the perpetual reminder of his wage-slavery, and the most potent argument for his solidarity with his fellow-workers.

And now comes the reason for his fear of coloured labour. The capitalist—in the midst of a Trade struggle, in which the workers are grimly holding out against famine in the hope of ensuring a decent sufficiency of food for themselves and their families in the future—the capitalist suddenly imports and dumps down in the area of struggle say a thousand indentured labourers, purchased in and exported from their native land in utter ignorance of the economic

[1] Reprinted from *The Commonweal*, July 24th, 1914.

conditions of the country in which they are landed, and in any case unable, by the terms of their indenture, to demand a higher wage than that for which they had sold themselves. They are a weapon in the hands of the capitalist, and he can use it with deadly effect. The possession of this weapon ensures to him the victory, and he can not only quietly leave his enemies to starve, but he can also enjoy a much increased profit on account of the slender wages he pays to his coloured serfs. For him, the plan is thus doubly advantageous, while for the starving workmen it is desperate. *They* cannot emigrate; *they* cannot live on the wage which seems luxurious to the simple villagers of a semi-tropical country, in which a cloth suffices for clothing, a palm-leaf covering for a roof, a couple of lumps of clay for a fire-place, and a handful of rice for a meal. They come, these coloured emigrants, smiling and docile; they save part of their wages; they wait, with Eastern patience, for the expiry of their indentures; and then they invest their savings in shrewdly selected articles, and become small traders growing into large ones.

To the white workmen this amiable swarm of indentured labourers are deadly enemies; they render his struggle hopeless; they condemn him to interminable poverty; he rises up against them, full of fury, and, wherever he holds power through the vote, he excludes them from the land in which he is fighting for decent conditions of life. Such are the facts of the case, and such is the motive which underlies the stubborn resistance in the Colonies to the importation of coloured labour. It is fundamentally an economic, rather than a racial objection.

How is the difficulty to be met? Capitalisation has become international; labour must become international

also. In the days of Charles Bradlaugh was founded an "International Society of Workers," and to this both he and I belonged. It did not succeed. The violent methods of foreign labourers aroused all the sober and constitutional instincts of the British Trade Unionists, and they drew back from such allies. Mr. Bradlaugh's ingrained love of law and order, and his confidence in the peaceful triumph of labour, once labour was educated and politically active, threw him into antagonism with the anarchical elements which crowded into the International. Himself utterly courageous—as he showed when he was Mazzini's messenger to enslaved Italy—and ever ready to risk his own life in a worthy cause, he refused to allow those who trusted him to be led into the paths of secret conspiracy and probable crime. The hopeful project failed. Yet in Internationalism lies Labour's hope, and above all is it urgently necessary that white Trade Unions should open their ranks to their coloured brethren, and thus effectively checkmate the capitalists when they play off coloured labour in trade disputes. The coloured labourers also suffer by the exploitation of their labour by capitalists, and they would learn gradually to assimilate the principles of Unionism. They are very shrewd although they are, for the most part, illiterate, and they are quick to see where their own advantage lies.

I do not say that there is no race-prejudice among English labourers. Do they not still regard the French as "froggies" and the Italians as "shrimps"? The brown skin is an additional offence. But I submit that the race-prejudice would disappear with the establishment of familiarity, if the economic dread could be put at rest. And this can only be done by the entry of coloured labour into white Unionism, and the total prohibition of the export of indentured labour.

THE SWADESHI MOVEMENT[1]

So much confusion exists in so many minds just now as to the real meaning and objects of the Swadeshi Movement, and so many attempts are being made to turn it to a temporary political purpose, that it is the duty of those who have been working in it for many years, and who realise its permanent value, to do their utmost to keep it on its proper lines and to preserve it for its proper purposes. Many agitators, who have been hitherto indifferent to the movement, and who have themselves been foremost in using foreign goods and in despising home-made, are now seeking to capture the movement and to turn it into a political weapon. In order to do this more effectually, they attack and abuse those who have steadily urged its importance to the welfare of India, and make the ludicrous attempt to represent themselves as the promoters of the movement and its previous workers as its enemies. Unfortunately, even the Government is to some extent deceived by them, and is inclined to regard the movement as sedition, whereas up to this time it had looked on it favourably. There is the more need for the quiet and steady workers for India's welfare not to allow themselves to be driven into a mistaken aloofness, but, in all loyalty and with perfect goodwill, to continue the propaganda of Swadeshism, as an economic necessity for Indian prosperity.

[1] Reprinted from *The Central Hindu College Magazine.*

No country can escape severe poverty, if it has but one industry, and that industry, agriculture, and even that agriculture of a too narrow kind. Slowly and steadily India has been losing the arts, crafts, and industries which once enriched her people. Her handicraftsmen, perfected by hundreds of generations, are being starved out for lack of customers to buy their products. In the desperate attempt to save their dwindling trade those that remain have copied bad Western models, and have striven to produce cheap and worthless goods to tempt "globe-trotters" into buying their wares. The cheapness is but apparent, for the work has become tenth-rate, the artistic goods vulgar and ill-finished, the cloths of little wearing value. A man buys a few cheap cloths every year, instead of a couple that last him for many years, and the prices of the "cheap" cloths added together are larger than the price paid for the good ones. Driven out of their own crafts by a lack of customers, the craftsmen have betaken themselves to the one possible industry open to them—agriculture. Already overcrowded, it becomes more overcrowded still. The balance of industries is disturbed, ryot and craftsman no longer support each other, and, when a bad year comes, the impoverished ryots and the artisans, turned into cultivators, are all engulfed in the yawning abyss of famine.

For all this Swadeshism is the remedy, and hence we cannot afford to renounce it because some people are trying to use it for local instead of national, for political instead of economic, purposes. Bengal is but a single Province, however important, and all the rest of India is not to be left to economic decay because Bengal is temporarily disturbed. Let us all work quietly on, as we have been

doing for years past, steadfastly pressing to the goal.

Our best C.H.C. students have been inspired with the idea of Swadeshism for a long time, and the Committee has been exerting a gentle pressure in that direction. It has been trying to induce the boys to adopt a distinctive Indian dress instead of the hybrid English costume which so many of them affect. At last this gentle pressure has taken effect, and in December the boarders petitioned the Committee to sanction anew the dress it had already advised. This was at once done, with the proviso that the materials used must be Swadeshi, and a large number of boys at once adopted the dress. Arrangements are being made to keep a large supply of Indian-made cloth in stock, and to have a tailor living on the premises, so as to facilitate the general adoption of the selected dress. On formal occasions a turban is to be worn, of very light yellow; in general, any Indian head-dress may be worn, turban or cap, or the boy may be bareheaded, in Bengali fashion. The coat is to be the long one, coming well below the knees, as used by the higher classes in these Provinces, or the chapkan, and is to be of Indian-made cloth, bluish grey in winter, white in summer. White pyjamas or pants are to be worn with it. In the house dhoti and shirt will be worn. One of our teachers is taking an interest in the improvement of the handlooms used in the Benares weaving trade, and we shall have weaving taught in our Technical Institute. So it may be that, presently, good, cheap, hand-made cloth may be available from our own looms.

Other colleges and schools might take similar steps, and thus help forward the Swadeshi Movement in the most practical manner. If, in addition,

they will encourage some of their best students to take up industrial pursuits instead of crowding into Law and Government service, they will make Swadeshism a success, and people and Government alike will rejoice.

Those who are circulating the statement that I am opposed to the Swadeshi Movement because I protected our students against unwise advice, might do worse than read the following, published in 1895, in a lecture entitled: "The Means of India's Regeneration." After various other suggestions, I said:

The next point is the building up of the entire Indian Nation, by the encouragement of national feeling, by maintaining the traditional dress, ways of living, and so on, by promoting Indian arts and manufactures, by giving preference to Indian products over foreign. Now this is a point which really goes to the very root of Indian revival. Do not undervalue the importance of sentiment, and do not try to do away with everything which differentiates India from other lands; rather strive to maintain the immemorial costumes, and follow the immemorial tradition, instead of trying to look as little Hindus as possible, as many of you are inclined to do. It is true, of course, that these are outside matters, but they have a very real effect on the generation and maintenance of national feeling.

And this leads me to the next point; namely, that it is the bounden duty of every patriotic Indian to encourage Indian art, Indian manufactures and Indian labour; and not to go across the seas to bring here endless manufactured articles, but to give work to his own people. Let all encourage Indian manufactures and arts, and use Indian-made goods in India. Indian art has gained a name all over the world because of its beauty and artistic finish, and

why should men who have such art on their own soil, why should they go and buy the shoddy productions of Birmingham and Manchester, why should they cast aside the labour of their own countrymen, why should they purchase foreign goods instead of home-made, and encourage bad art instead of good? There is really no excuse for leaving Indian National Art to perish, for this is an important thing in a nation's well-being, and especially the encouragement of all those forms of art which depend upon the delicacy of human faculty, refine the people at large, and increase the material progress of the nation. Why, if you take some of the foreign manufactured goods, and compare them with the Indian, what do you see? You find that, in the Indian, the colours are most delicately graduated and blended, giving an exquisite softness of shading to the Indian carpet, and this is the result of generations of physical training in the sense of colour; while in the carpet of foreign manufacture, it is harsh and crude, and there is no need to print upon it "manufactured in Germany" for you have only to look at its colouring to know it is not Indian. You are therefore injuring your own beautiful national art by using inferior goods of foreign make, and extinguishing Indian trade by continuing to encourage foreign goods, to the impoverishment of India and to the throwing of Indians out of employment. Look also at the large prices the people in England are ready to pay for Indian art objects.

I urge you therefore to support your own labourers, thus strengthening your manufactures and arts, and laying a sound material foundation for national wealth. The strengthening and developing of these Indian industries is the work to which Vaishyas should devote themselves, for that is the work

essentially belonging to their caste, on which of old the material welfare of the nation hung. You would also have coming to you constant demands from foreigners who purchase Indian goods because of their beauty. And we must press upon wealthy men that instead of sending to England to buy costly furniture, they should spend their money at home in encouraging the arts which are around them in their Motherland, so that a public opinion may be formed which would cry "shame" upon a Prince or Rajah who filled his palace with foreign articles instead of having them produced in his own country, so that his wealth should add to the comfort and happiness of the people and strengthen the national prosperity. These would awaken a sense of Nationality, filtering down from the higher to the lower, regenerating the Nation, and striking its roots deep down into the physical lives of the people, uniting all India, binding all India together closer and closer and closer, till her oneness is realised, till Indians recognise themselves a people.

FEDERATION[1]

I

THE problem of building up the Empire by a Federation of Self-Governing Nations has suddenly sprung to the front, as a burning political question, by the exigencies of the Home Rule situation, created by the resistance of Ulster. Many publicists in India, unacquainted with the stern and dour nature of the Protestants of Ulster—the descendants of the men and women who held Londonderry through a siege of terrible severity, and thereby prevented James II from wresting Ireland away from William of Orange and the British Crown bestowed on him by the nation —took their signing of the Covenant and their raising of a citizen army as mere bluster, and imagined that the resistance would be of words only. Mr. Asquith judged more wisely, and realised that he could only force Home Rule on Ulster at the point of the bayonet, and that, even then, a long and bloody struggle would have to be waged of which the issue was very doubtful. It seemed probable that the struggle would spread to England, and that civil war was menacing the whole kingdom, with inimical forces on the Continent likely to intervene. The strength of the English feeling is shown by the constitution of the League of British Covenanters with Earl Roberts, the pet of the army, at its head, and by the enormous Hyde Park Demonstration—the favourite Radical weapon—with its fourteen platforms, its twenty-two processions, its banners representing seventy-six constituencies of Greater London, and with Mr. Balfour

[1] **Reprinted from *The Commonweal*, April 10th, and 17th, 1914.**

speaking in Hyde Park for the first time in his life. That polished Parliamentarian can hardly have recognised himself as a speaker at a huge Hyde Park meeting!

The position is unprecedented, but the purpose underlying it is obvious—to create a situation in which the problem of Federalism *must* come to the front, and the ideal of a few "dreamers" shall enter—more rapidly than had seemed possible—the sphere of practical politics.

For many years I have ventured to suggest that universal suffrage—male and female—should be the basis of Government in Village Councils and Municipal Boards; a more restricted suffrage with higher qualifications as the area of rule extended up to National Parliaments; with an Imperial Council "of the wisest of the Empire" round the Monarch, "men of light and leading from every part of the Empire". Several years ago, when there was a symposium in *Nash's Magazine* on Home Rule, I submitted that Home Rule should be general, not special, and that Home Rule for Ireland should be a part of a scheme of National Home Rule in general, so as to remove the general questions from the local, the imperial from the purely national. A year or so ago, Mr. Churchill suggested a similar idea, and was much ridiculed for it in the press. Now that Home Rule for Ireland alone has led us to the brink of civil war, a plan of the kind is becoming inevitable.

It is now suggested that the six years of consideration, during which Ulster shall remain outside the proposed Irish Government, shall be used to develop a scheme of "devolution," of Home Rule for each of the constituent parts of the British Isles. Sir Edward Grey has proposed that the discussion on the

present Home Rule Bill shall be resumed on the basis of establishing a Federal system for the whole country, and certainly he cannot have made the suggestion without the assent of the Government. The proposal has been echoed from the Opposition benches, and some fifty members have held a meeting in favour of solving the Home Rule question on the lines of Federation. An amendment to the present Bill has been drafted, embodying this view, and while it is hardly likely to pass, it is well that the proposal should be thus definitely formulated, so that within the six years after the Bill has become law, the general Federal scheme may be discussed and there may be time for public opinion to ripen. A Radical member made a proposition, "cordially received on both sides," that the two great parties in the House should unite, after the Home Rule Bill had passed the Commons, in order to establish a Convention, in which the details of a Federal scheme should be elaborated.

When Federation, with its local Parliaments, has been established in the British Isles, the creation of an Imperial Parliament will have become inevitable, and it is obvious, from the discussions already going on, that the Self-Governing Colonies will claim representation therein. It is clear that there will be Provincial Parliaments for local affairs—as now in Australia—and National Parliaments for national affairs. But in this there is nothing new, for in the United States we see working the State Legislatures, with power restricted to each State, and the National Houses at Washington, legislating for the whole body of States as constituting the American Nation. In America, which has no Empire, this suffices for the Legislative Power; but the British Empire with its overseas Dominions needs one loftier and all-dominating authority; therefore beyond these must come the

Imperial Parliament, the embodiment of the whole Empire, making the Empire articulate. Every autonomous Nation within the Empire must be therein represented.

It may be remembered that Lord Acton considered that the only way of preserving liberty while establishing a central Power competent to hold widely-spread territories together was to set up Imperialism in a Federal form. Liberty is preserved by Self-Government within each Nation ; Power is rendered possible by a body, in which each Nation is represented, wielding the combined force of all. Can a Democracy rule an Empire, is a question sometimes asked. Only if each Nation rules its own internal affairs, and sends representatives to a central body which shall administer the affairs in which all are concerned. Such is the general scheme towards which we are irresistibly being pushed.

How will this affect India ?

To that question I will venture to submit an answer next week, and I earnestly hope that we shall have a serious and weighty discussion on this matter. The columns of *The Commonweal* are open to all views on the question, from the view that looks on India as a "child-nation," a "lesser nation," to that which regards her as an equal partner in the Empire—the view which governs the editorial policy.

II

The last article closed with the question : " How will this [the Federal idea applied to the Empire] affect India ? " To that question, I submit the following answer, for this great section of the Empire cannot be left out in the problem set forth, on the right solution of which depend the peace of the world and the happiness of unborn generations.

To answer it aright, India must immediately address herself to the preparation needed, and her sons must shoulder local responsibilities which are the practical training for National Self-Government. H. E. Lord Pentland has pointed to these, looking forward evidently to the rising of India into National Self-Government, for the foundations must be laid deep and strong for an edifice which is to be crowned with a National Parliament. England and the Self-Governing Colonies already have these, we have them partially, feeble and but half alive. Our first task is to supply them where lacking, and to organise them fully, the next to vitalise them where they exist, so that the Legislative Councils and the Provincial Governments may be supplied with all the local information needed for due administrative action by what are really the beginnings of Provincial Parliaments—information as to needs to be supplied, grievances to be redressed, local peculiarities and customs to be taken into account. Only with such effective bodies below it, each efficiently performing its own work, can the central body properly discharge its duties. No longer must Indians look to the Government to initiate and to guide, they must themselves take the initiative and propose the necessary changes, giving the information which will guide the Government in the administration of the central funds, and the co-ordination of the various local bodies.

Now for this preliminary work of preparing the foundations of Self-Government, we must look to the District Conferences already existing. The Theosophical Conferences naturally work chiefly along religious and educational lines, the Social Conferences along social, the Political along political, and in periodical joint deliberations their forces should be united for co-ordinated harmonious action. Hence

the tendency which is showing itself in Southern India to draw together these different groups of whole-hearted lovers of the Motherland by holding their Conferences at the same place and time is of fairest augury for the future. Religious, educational, social, political, workers are all uniting to form one National Movement, a Movement which, gathering force as it proceeds, will gradually become irresistible, absorbing into itself all the highest and best elements to be found in India, including the best in the English official class, who honestly desire to help India to Self-Government. Self-Government under the Imperial Crown must be the aim recognised by all who enter into this Movement; there should be, as the next step, established in each area the four departments of the National work, a department controlling religious endowments, and adapting their use to the needs of the time, a department controlling educational institutions, a department organising industries, agriculture, trading associations, local administrative and judicial affairs and reforming social customs, a department dealing with civil and political matters and preparing legislation.

These should form the central fourfold Sabha, working in a defined area—a village, a group of villages, a district, etc. In the fundamental unit, the village, this central Sabha—one Committee with the four sub-committees—should be at once established, *i.e.*, a village should have its Council, its Panchayat—to use the old term—with the four departments, each controlling its share of the local activities, and reporting its detailed work to the Council as a whole, which would assign to each its share of the available funds. Such a Village Council would be able, at any moment, to supply detailed information as to its village, its industries, its education, its roads, its

sanitation, its agriculture, its needs, its surplus of any kind. Above this would come a similar Council for a group of villages, which would see to communications between villages, co-operation between them for the sharing of agricultural and other machinery (lighting, grinding, etc.), the breeding of cattle, etc., the gathering of surplus products and their forwarding to a common centre, the supply of necessary materials for industry and agriculture (cotton, silk, manures, etc.), beyond the easy reach of the separate villages at remunerative prices, hospital accommodation, model farm, technical elementary school, and anything else better done by a group than by a village. Next the District Council on the same lines, dealing with all that demands higher intelligence for organisation, central stores for collection and distribution, higher schools, literary and technical; here, probably, would come the supervision of the religious endowments of the whole district, and their administration in the way most conducive to the welfare of the community—its temples, its schools, its poor, all coming within this distribution. Here would be collected and classified all the records concerning the district, ready for the information of the Provincial Parliament, enabling a wise distribution of Provincial funds.

The preliminary machinery for the establishment of these graded Councils should at once be taken in hand, and for the beginning of this we must look to the educated men of the towns, who gather in the District Conference and could map out the District and assign the local workers. The Co-operative Movement may serve as model, for it was started and nourished by these men, and they still initiate each additional centre. These pioneers retire as soon as the village can walk alone, and start a similar organisation in another village. One or more such

men would, by consultation with the villagers, establish the first Village Council, which later would be elected by all the householders. The number would be decided by the amount of work to be done. The next higher unit, the group, would probably be elected by the Village Councils, the next higher by the Group Councils. The outline of this should be discussed and decided by a joint meeting of the District Conferences. Thus would be builded up a graded organisation, until the Provincial Parliament is reached, and these are unified by the National Parliament. Thus would Self-Government be established throughout the land, and India would be ready to take her place in a Federal Empire, and to send her representatives to the Imperial Parliament.

One matter of immediate importance is the forming of a Provincial Committee with District Sub-Committees for the selection of candidates for all elective offices in each Presidency—Legislative Councils, District Boards, Municipalities, etc. In every election, candidates belonging to the National Party should be ready, presented to the constituencies long before elections begin, that they may be familiar to those whom they seek to represent. The appointment of these Political Committees and Sub-Committees in this Presidency should be at once taken in hand by the Madras Indian leaders, though later they would probably be appointed for each area by the Council administering it. Thi[illegible]isation must be begun in the centre, and spr[illegible]er the Presidency, while the gen[illegible] territorial organisation for Self-Government sh[illegible] be sanctioned by Congress for the whole of India and committed by it to its District Committees fo[illegible] the local discussion through their Conferences allied with the Social and Theosophical

MEMORIA[illegible] V.R.NARLA D.P.R.I.

INDIAN SELF-GOVERNMENT[1]

In this pause, wherein internal controversy is silenced, while the thunder of guns rolls over the battle-fields where Nations are at death-grips; in this hour of waiting, while the destinies of Empires are flung into the scales of War; we, in India, have time for earnest thinking, for solemn preparation, for that serious constructive work, on which the immediate future of India depends. The Leader whose departure has set our hearts a-bleeding, had his mind set on this problem when he was shadowed by the wings of death. In my last visit to his Poona home, most of the hours of which were spent with him, this was one of the subjects which we discussed, and he spoke of the Provincial Parliament, how it should be constituted, and the powers it should wield, and how it might be so framed as to make it a stepping-stone towards full National Self-Government.

He, too, saw that the present time was apt for such discussion among thinkers, so that when the War was over, India might be ready to take her rightful place in the Empire.

In the West, Democracy has taken on a form which has been shaped in the strife of classes, and the masses of the people, a true proletariat, landless and ignorant, with no possession save their naked labour, which they must sell or starve, have naturally

[1] Reprinted from *The Commonweal*, March 19th, 1915.

seen their power in their numbers, and every struggle has been a struggle against the smaller possessing and educated class, and has ended in an enlarged franchise, a franchise extorted by riot and fear of increasing riot. Each extension has been wrested from the holders of power, and the right to elect a member of Parliament became the hall-mark of the citizen. "A vote for a member" was the goal of every struggle. The result has been an overburdened Popular House, unable to cope with the mass of public business tossed into it; everything, from the village pump to the King's authority, was to be settled by Parliament.

The older system of village communities and the National Witenagemot gave way before the feudalism of the Normans; and then came the rising of towns, and the merchants, and the urban organisations, out of which grew the House of Commons. So that the strife was first between Crown and Barons; and then between Barons and Commoners; and then the slaying of Barons, and a Crown over against an awakening Nation; and then a Crown faced by an oligarchy, which fettered the Crown and did not free the people; and then the fight of one stratum of people after another for the freedom which consisted of a vote for the Commons. Thus, finally, Democracy voiced its demand as Universal Suffrage, and the elimination of all "fancy franchises" that sought to give weight to aught but numbers, and "one man, one vote" became the watchword—the counting of heads.

In India, nothing of this kind of struggle has been known in her long history. Village Government she had, and the idea and the capacity for carrying out the idea have never quite disappeared from the village folk. Above the village came the group of ten villages, and groups of ten villages formed the larger group of 100 villages, and so onwards up to the

Council of the King. The political arrangement was not based on voting, but rather on a representation of organic units, linked into an organisation for the promotion of general well-being, rather than for the possession of power as against others, either for offence or defence. Life and comfort were the objects of the social state rather than power. The first charge on the peasant's harvest was the food for himself and his family until the next harvest came round; the next charge was the seed-corn, requisite for the sowing of that harvest: after that came the claim of the Ruler.

Out of a past so different, a different type of Self-Government may be expected to arise, and nothing would be more unlikely to prove successful than a bestowal on the peasantry of a voting power through which they should decide the fate of Governments.

Here we come to the question which we ought to discuss. Do we want here a replica of English Self-Government, in the form which England, with the wide extension of the suffrage, is discovering to be unworkable? English politicians of the more far-seeing type are beginning to talk about "devolution," and of providing England with five or six Parliaments, each locally autonomous. But no one has yet ventured to tackle the thorny question of the franchises for these local Parliaments and for the Imperial Parliament. Will the labourer, and the miner, and the docker, and the factory hand, be satisfied to exchange the Imperial franchise for the local one? It is a parlous question.

Why should we plunge into this road which will land us, as it has landed England, in a bog? Devolution is an awkward process; evolution is natural and easy. Shall we not try to evolve?

The village is the unit, and there suffrage may be universal—the fathers and mothers of the village, above the age of 21 years, form a natural electorate, and they elect the Village Council, dealing with village questions, with matters known to all, on which all can form opinions. That the voter should understand, and be capable of forming an opinion on, the questions which his representative is going to decide is a *sine qua non*, if Democracy is to be aught but a chaos. The Village Council, the revived, modernised, improved Panchayat, would deal with all matters wherein the village is self-contained—sanitation, hygiene, village co-operation, wells, irrigation, tree-planting, elementary schools—though here comes a link with the outside—workshops, disputes, suits up to a certain value, internal roads, etc. Meanwhile, a knowledge of the three R's, and of some geography—geography of the district, at least—should be necessary for membership in the Village Council, but knowledge of village life and village needs is a more important qualification.

In the towns, there should be a group of Ward Councils, in which universal suffrage should equally be the rule, the electors being over the age of 21; and the Ward Councils should be responsible for the smaller matters now so much neglected, elementary schools, scavenging, sanitation, prevention of the adulteration of food-stuffs, street water-standards, troughs for horses and draught-cattle, etc.

Taluq Boards in the country and Municipalities in the towns below a certain population would be the second grade of Councils, and these should be elected by the first grade Councils, and by all men and women in the area who had reached a certain standard of education, and had attained a certain age, say 25. They should have charge of secondary and high

schools, model farms, technical institutes, markets, electric power installations, and such part of the administration of roads, lighting, etc., as may be handed over to them by the District Boards, and should form a kind of court of appeal when any wrong or lapse of duty occurred in the Village Councils.

District Boards and Municipalities of towns above a certain population would form Councils of the third grade. These again would be elected by the Councils of the second grade, and by all men and women over the age of 30, who had reached a certain educational standard. Roads, local railways, colleges—including agricultural and technical as well as arts and sciences—the general supervision and fixing of localities for large markets, agricultural and technical shows, etc., the fixing of the proportion of money to be raised by local taxation in each subdivision, would be some of their duties.

Above these come the Provincial Parliaments, to be elected by Councils of the third grade and by all men and women over 35, who have reached a certain educational standard. The provincial University or Universities, provincial railways, and all the larger concerns of provincial life would come under their administration.

Above these would be the National Parliament, controlling all National affairs, post, railways, army, navy, etc. The electorate there would be the Provincial Parliaments, and men and women over 40, of University or equivalent educational standard.

Thus might complete Self-Government come about, built from below upwards into a secure and stately edifice. The administration of Justice is not here dealt with; the appointment of Judges of all ranks should probably come from above downwards, in

order to secure independence of the immediate local authority, always a menace to the Bench. We have seen in the United States the degradation of Justice which has arisen from bringing the Justiciary under popular control.

The qualifications of members of Councils of each grade should be generally: (1) Knowledge—proportionate to the Council, entrance to which is sought, the educational qualification being higher than that of the electors; (2) High moral character; (3) Experience of administration in a lower grade Council, or some public body, large business concern, or equivalent; (4) Age.

Conviction of an offence involving moral turpitude should be a disqualification either for the exercise of the franchise or for membership in a Council. Whether this should be for a term of years, or for life, is a matter for consideration, and might form part of the sentence.

While conviction should be a disqualification, high moral character should be a necessary qualification. It is sometimes said that a man's private life is no concern of the State, and it is true that anything like a moral inquisition is detestable. But a man's neighbours, his community, know his general character, and respect or distrust him according to their knowledge. His bearing among his fellows, his uprightness, his honour, his candour, his magnanimity, all these are known, and win public trust. No amount of anonymous abuse or journalistic malice permanently shake public confidence in a person whose character is unblemished, though they may cause a wave of prejudice. No illustration shows this better than the case of Charles Bradlaugh, whose atheism was used to connote moral wrong. He triumphed over all slander because it had no real

ground. S. Paul once asked as to a Bishop: if a man cannot rule his own household, how should he rule the Church of God?—and the argument is valid. If a man is untrustworthy in his private life, how shall he be trusted in public affairs? A man is a unit, and he cannot be divided into water-tight compartments.

Some experience in administration is needed before large public affairs can be well dealt with. A man must not experiment with public business on a large scale without experience on a smaller.

As regards age, we may tentatively place it at five years above the minimum age of the elector; but it may be that this should not be laid down at all. A wise youngster is better than an old fool, and minds and souls do not match bodies in their age.

Such is a very rough outline of a scheme, intended only to serve as a basis for discussion. I believe that this question should be brought before all political organisations of this country, and should be thoroughly debated from every point of view. Thus only can a satisfactory and workable plan be arrived at, each stage being taken up and worked out in practice as the foundation for the next. The Village Councils should be instituted at once; the constitution of the present Taluq Boards should be reformed immediately, and that of District Boards should quickly follow, both being made entirely elective. Then, when the War, is over, steps should be taken to establish Provincial Autonomy, and the time for the establishment of a National Parliament fixed.

Dealing only with India, I have not touched on the Imperial Parliament, above all the Self-Governing units, federated into an Empire. The post, army, and navy, spoken of above, would link on to the Imperial organisation.

INDIA'S MISSION AMONG NATIONS[1]

Every person, every race, every nation, has its own particular keynote which it brings to the general chord of life and of humanity. Life is not a monotone but a many-stringed harmony, and to this harmony is contributed a distinctive note by each people that becomes a marked nationality. Thus Rome struck the note of civic greatness, devotion to the State as the ideal of the citizen, conquest for the glory of the State as the national duty; Greece struck the note of intellectual greatness, enriching the art and the literature of the world with priceless treasures, and impressing even on her conquerors the stamp of her intellectual royalty. And India, rising high above them both, struck the note of spiritual greatness, of pure devotion to a spiritual ideal, of worship that asked only to become what it adored, of the gathering of spiritual knowledge. The three nations may stand as types of humanity physical, humanity psychical, humanity spiritual, and while the two that represented the transitory body and the transitory mind have perished, leaving only their history, the one that represented and represents the immortal spirit remains, for, as Sri Krishna says, the spirit is "unborn, constant, eternal and ancient, nor does it perish in the perishing body".

India's body may perish as a body politic, but her eternal spirit remains, the spirit that has made Aryavarta the cradle of religions and her scriptures the fountain-head of all the scriptures of later faiths.

This spirituality of India has, then, been her contribution to the world's progress, and it has manifested

[1] Reprinted from *The National Educator.*

itself in the dual aspect of wisdom and devotion, Jnana and Bhakti. Thus she has wedded philosophy and religion and shown them both as aspects of spirituality, the noblest religion enshrined in the sublimest philosophy. Not without significance it is that in the great temple at Madura, the worshipper must stop and pay homage to Ganesha ere he can pass onward to the shrine of Shiva, for Mahadeva, the great God, must be offered wisdom as well as love by His devotee, if the devotee would pass into the innermost recess and pay his homage to the lotus-feet of Maha-yogi, the source of wisdom as of love.

And it is the perpetual affirmation of spirituality as the highest good that is India's mission to the world. As her past glory resulted from her spiritual knowledge and devotion, so must her future be based on the revival and reproclamation of the same. Her genius is for religion and not for politics, and her most gifted children are needed as spiritual teachers, not as competing candidates in the political arena. Let lesser nations and lesser men fight for conquest, for place and for power; these gimcracks are toys for children, and the children should be left to quarrel over them. India is the one country in the world in which it is still easy to be religious, in which the atmosphere of the land and the psychic currents are not yet wholly penetrated with materiality. If religion perish here, it will perish everywhere, and in India's hand is laid the sacred charge of keeping alight the torch of spirit amid the fogs and storms of increasing materialism. If that torch drops from her hands, its flame will be trampled out by the feet of hurrying multitudes, eager for worldly good, and India, bereft of spirituality, will have no future, but will pass on into the darkness, as Greece and Rome have passed.

II. EDUCATIONAL

EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL DUTY[1]

OUR subject to-night is the subject of Education, one that is of the most vital moment to every thinker and every lover of his country, for on Education depends the future of the land, and no one who has the interest of his country at heart can afford to ignore the question of National Education. I have worded our subject, "Education as a National Duty," and this form of words is chosen because I would thus bring home to you that Education is not so much a matter for the Government as it is the duty of the people. To be really successful it must be taken up, designed, guided, and carried out, by those who are not only the lovers of their country, but who are also men who understand its needs and are well aware of its peculiarities, of its characteristics, and of its traditions. To be truly useful, Education must be founded on a knowledge of the past of the country as well as of its present; it must be designed in accordance with the ancient traditions and national habits, and adapted to modern necessities, to meet at every point the growing needs of an ever-increasing nation.

Education, rightly considered, is not a matter chiefly for those who are sometimes called educational experts; I mean, it is not a matter which ought to be exclusively guided and directed by those who are concerned in the carrying out of the work of teaching,

[1] A lecture delivered in Bombay, on March 9th, 1903.

i.e., those who form a part either of the Educational Departments, or of the educational staffs of the various collegiate and scholastic institutions of the land. There is always a danger of narrowing too much the lines of activity by what may be called the technical specialised lines of work. A man who has been a teacher all his life will give knowledge in a definite groove; will give too much consideration to the minutiæ of the appointed subjects and too little to the principles of Education; will think too much of the question of examination and too little of that real Education which turns out men developed on all sides, and able to take up the work of men in the world. We always find that a specialist is bound to become too narrow, too dogmatic, and too wedded to particular fashions; and for that reason, in dealing with Education, you want to rouse on the question intelligent and popular opinion: the opinions of statesmen, of patriots, of officials, of men of business, of fathers, of guardians of the young, should come into the Councils of all educational institutions. They should bring thither their experience of the world, their knowledge of the country, and their insight into the needs and possibilities of the country, to shape a wide scheme of Education and to carry it out in an effective way.

You will see exactly what I mean by the danger of having Education guided only by a narrow type of experts, when you look at the Education given to-day in this country. True Education is subordinated to the wants of the examination room; far more time is given to guessing what the examiner is likely to set in the way of questions, and trying to cram the boy with "notes" that will give him success in his examination, than to the training of the boy in a way that will make him an intelligent citizen.

What is wanted in Education is that such men as I have named above should formulate a correct theory, and then give it to the professional educationists to be carried into practice. We want men of wide knowledge of the country on the one side, and educational experts on the other.

I will put this more definitely. In my own personal experience I have had some means of judging of the kind of work that is the most useful and proper preparation for dealing with Education. In my own personal life I have had experience along three lines. Two in the line of an educational expert, as a Member of the great School Board of London, having had the duty of looking after a large number of schools personally, and of debating all questions arising on general educational policy; at another time, for several years, I discharged the duty of teaching classes, under South Kensington, and was exceptionally successful in results. But I consider that those two lines of experience, useful as they were, are comparatively useless as compared with the experience that I have gained as a student of national life, as a student of the needs of different classes in society and of the ways in which those needs may be met, as a student of politics and of social questions; these studies give the most useful results in the shaping of educational schemes. That is the experience which is needed to decide on the knowledge to be given in the class-room, while the method of the giving is rightly within the administration of the Educational Department.

This is why I call Education a national duty. There may be many of you who are not accustomed to preparing the time-tables for schools or colleges; many of you have done little work in the drawing up of a definite curriculum. You would find that a very hard

task. Many of you would be unable, if you were to attempt to make a list of useful text-books, to frame such a list with success. But if you study your country and know the kind of men that your country needs, if you have experience, whether in the Government service, whether in administrative work, whether in a judicial capacity, whether in the working of manufactures, commerce, or science, that experience enables you to judge the kind of men that India needs; and when you know the kind of men that are wanted, then it is easy to frame a scheme of Education which will provide men to meet the necessities of the land.

I think, then, that every thoughtful man and woman should study the question of Education, and form on it a definite, rational opinion. Only thus can Education be rightly guarded, and the tendency of its becoming too mechanical, too formal and too separate from the real life of the nation thus be guarded against. Let me illustrate what I mean by one case which will show you graphically the distinction between the technical expert and the man who has wide knowledge of the country and insight into its needs. Take the example of the English Parliament. Its duty is to make laws, and therefore, according to the principle of some of the educationists, only lawyers should be members of Parliament; men of all types should not be found there, and all public criticism and all public advice should be shut out from a Parliament which should be composed only of legal experts. But every one knows that such a Parliament would be utterly inadequate for the needs of the Empire. What is wanted in Parliament is a body of men who understand the country's needs, its wants, and its powers. The most varied experiences, men from all lines of life, are sought. The lawyer-members are a very small minority, and they are wanted in Parliament not so much for the decision

of the principles of the laws required, as for the technical drawing up of the law itself, and the giving of accurate details for the definite working out of the law. And so for us in Education; we want the technical knowledge of experts for the working out of the programme, but the programme itself should be made by the wisest heads in the nation.

I said just now that Education is not so much a matter for the Government as for the nation. One of the difficulties of Education in India is the fact that it is too much a Government affair. I was glad to see Sir Michael Hicks Beach, one of the leading English statesmen, lately declaring at Aligarh that the Universities should be entirely free from Government control, that Government had nothing to do, or ought to have nothing to do, with the Universities. That is the case in England, and the system works perfectly well. The Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Durham, Dublin, Glasgow and Edinburgh have all grown out of private endowments, endowments given by Kings, nobles or gentlemen. They rest on donations of great and philanthropic men; they were founded by patriots in the past, and are supported by patriots in the present; they do not look to Government for monetary support. For, wherever money is taken from Government, Government has the right and the duty to supervise the way in which that money is employed. What is wanted in Education is that the country itself should build its Universities and support its schools.

The Universities should have the wisest heads of the country on their Councils, but they should not be under Government. You can see how the system works in the United Kingdom. You find there that many a statesman covets the post of what is called the Rectorship of one of the great Universities.

A man like Lord Rosebery, a late Prime Minister and probably a future Prime Minister, has stood for the Rectorship of the Glasgow University. He has been elected there as a thinker, a statesman, and a patriot, and not as a Prime Minister of the Empire.

The more in this way you can link the institutions and the nation together, the better for the land; and what we want in the Senates of our Universities now is that they should be bodies recruited from all that is most thoughtful, most cultured, most patriotic and most self-sacrificing in the country. They should not be half filled with nominees who know nothing of Education. That is the kind of reform that you want in Education here. You must have independent, learned and patriotic bodies, which shall make the Education of the young their primary aim.

To pass from that to what ought to be the aim of Education. The aim of Education at the present time in India appears to be the gaining of a degree, and when you ask: "Why do people want a degree?" the answer is: "That they may go into Government service or into the learned professions." A man becomes a Bachelor of Arts not that he may know literature, not that he may understand history, not that he may be a student of philosophy, but that he may be a Vakil or a Government servant. Now the getting of a degree is not the true aim of Education. The aim of Education is to draw out all the faculties of the boy on every side of his nature, to develop in him every intellectual and moral power, and to strengthen him physically, emotionally, mentally and spiritually, that he may turn out at the end of his College career a useful, patriotic, pious gentleman, who respects himself and respects those around him. Education is a failure when it is simply cramming the boy's head with a lot of

disjointed facts, poured into his head as into a basket, to be emptied out again in the examination room, and the empty basket carried out again into the world. It is not a good education which, when a boy has passed his examination, leaves him a nervous wreck, exhausted as to his body and overstrained as to his brain. When a boy goes out of his college, he should be full of life, full of energy, and full of delight in his young life, to take up the burden of the work of the world. He should not be nerve-exhausted and nerve-overstrained, when he has finished his educational career. I have often seen boys so anxious about the result of the examination that they were ill. In some cases, when lads failed in their examination they committed suicide. That is a horrible thing—a shocking commentary on the pressure that was put on the lad's young and tender frame. To exhaust the strength, to destroy the energy, to turn out a sickly, worn-out man, when the youth should be brimming over with life, has been the result of the system of Education prevalent in the land.

What is the Education that we require ? I used just now four words in describing the nature of the boy. First, "physically"—unless a boy's body is strong and healthy he cannot, as a man, do all he should in life and for his country. The training of the boy's body is as important a part of Education as the training of his mind. His body should be kept frugally and simply, so that he may be strong and healthy, and not indolent and lazy. He should be trained in gymnastic exercises and in games of every kind. He should be trained to regard his body as an instrument for working in the world. His duty to his body is a part of his duty to his country and to himself. No school, no college does its duty where

physical training is not definitely a part of its curriculum. The physical training does not really stop with the body, as when we speak of the training by games. Has it ever struck you, while scrutinising Indian character, what are some of the qualities that most need to be developed in the young? They are: quickness in understanding of thought, alertness in understanding the situation, swiftness of decision, promptitude of action, and accuracy of judgment. These qualities are wanted to make a good citizen and a useful man, and these are the qualities which are largely developed on the playing-field, in the games. The boy learns in the games alertness and quickness in seeing his opportunity, and promptitude in using it. He learns to work with others by subordinating himself to a common object, and to subordinate his own success to that of his side. He learns the very qualities which are wanted in the man of action, in the true patriot. I would rather at present see an Indian boy skilfully playing on the play-ground than working in his class-room; because there is no doubt about the brilliancy of his intelligence, but there is a very great doubt about his practical capacity. That is too often lying dormant. Rouse it then by training and development.

Secondly, I used the word "emotionally". It is necessary in our national education to give a most important place to what is called "Moral Education". Let us pause for a moment to consider what is meant by "Moral". Let us see exactly what we mean. We find in ourselves certain things that we call emotions and feelings. As we study emotion, we recognise the enormous part that it plays in life. As we study emotion, we find that out of emotion grow up all the attractions that make a family, a town, a community, and a nation—that bind men together into nations

and peoples. We notice also that, on the other side, from emotions also grow up all the forces that pull down as well as construct; by emotion families are disintegrated, communities are broken up, and nations are destroyed. While on the one side emotion builds society, on the other side it breaks it down. The moment this is recognised, the culture of emotion is seen to be of vital importance for the State and for the nation, and we find, on further study, that every virtue and every vice has its root in emotion. Virtuous is the man who discharges to all around him the obligations that arise in his relation with them. The virtuous man performs these duties as perfectly as if love between him and others were the only motive of action. Each father does his duty to his son because he loves him; each brother does his duty to his brother because he loves him; so a man should do his duty to all the weak and the inferior as to his sons, to all his equals as to his brothers. He recognises the bond of duty to all around him. He recognises that he owes to all, that which he gives to his dear ones by the inspiration of love. Thus does the love-emotion work out in our relation with each other; as a permanent mood it is virtue, and it builds up families and States. But emotion of the opposite kind, the hate-emotion, is the root of all vices, and it breaks up human relations, drives men apart from each other, and leads them to destruction. All the vices that ruin nations grow out of the hate-emotion between man and man. When this is recognised, the culture of emotion necessarily becomes a vital part of Education. You must teach your boy to cultivate emotion on the side of love, the emotion which grows into virtues. You must teach him to discourage emotion on the side of hate, the emotion which grows into vices. You must teach him to love his fellows

as if they belonged to his family, and to love his nation as if it were a part of his family. You must teach him that national life depends on the unity of the organism that we call a nation. Take an educated man whose emotional training has been neglected; how can he carry out the work of the world? He thinks of his own gain, his own advantage and his own prosperity, but he does not look to the national welfare. He thinks how he can profit, but not how his nation may thrive. He thinks how he may grow rich, but not how the nation may be prosperous. That individual, therefore, strikes at the root of the national welfare and brings about the decay of the people.

A father, who has gained wealth selfishly, without regard to the national good, sees the nation growing less and less prosperous, and he knows that his own children and grandchildren have to be members of that decaying nation, and that his selfishness has undermined his family as well as injured his nation. A man who has only thought of his own gain and of his own advancement finds that the other parts of the nation are suffering, and that he is compelled to share the sufferings with them. A number of men rush into Government service, or into the learned professions, thinking only of getting on in the world. But what meanwhile happens to India? Her agriculture gradually grows less and less effective, her industries decay, her manufactures fail, and her wealth is diminished. Does the successful lawyer escape from the result of the general national decay, and can he separate himself off from the descent of the people? Agriculture does not affect the agricultural labourers alone, or the landholders alone; every class of the community suffers when the agricultural results are poor. God has bound the classes of the nation

together, and the national prosperity depends upon the public spirit of the people, upon the consideration of the whole nation, and upon the subordination of individual gains to the general good and the common prosperity.

These lessons your boys should learn while their minds are plastic, and while their hearts are enthusiastic, in the days of their youth. You must hold up before them the great ideal, you must fire their hearts with love for this land, you must teach them their past in order that they may create the greater future, and you must ask them to love their country in order that that country may rise in the scale of nations. Think what these boys are—boys now, they are the coming citizens of the country; boys for the moment, they are the creators of India in the near future. You who are grown up are the India of to-day, but the India of the future depends on the young boys. That is why every statesman, every great statesman, concerns himself with the Education of the young. That is why men like Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury concerned themselves with the question of Education. They knew that the future of the nation depends on the boys in the school, and just as those boys are trained, the future of the nation will be. Moral Education, thus, is vital for the future of India.

My third was "mentally". On the intellectual side of education I was speaking to you the other day, and I need not repeat what then I said. I would only remind you that what is most wanted in that intellectual Education is a scientific Education rather than an exclusively literary one, an Education that will add to the productive resources of the country and not lead only to the learned professions. I do not mean that the learned professions are not necessary for the

welfare of the State. They are entirely necessary, but they should not absorb the whole of the brilliant intelligences of the country, and starve the other side of national life, which is equally wanted for the welfare of the people. And let me add to this the bearing of Education on commerce. In the days of old you were a great commercial people; you were great shipbuilders, sending your ships over the whole world and carrying on a great commerce. You may read history, and you will find that, only some three hundred years ago, ships built in India sailed up the Thames to London, and were regarded with envy and admiration because of their admirable workmanship. You will find that you had plenty of good sailors, plenty of enterprising merchants, and plenty of men who carried on the active work of commerce, enriching their country at the same time that they enriched themselves. Unless you educate your trading classes, you will never revive that commerce of the past. Shrewd as the commercial classes are, they are too narrow in their views, and too wedded to their particular fashions to do what is needed for the nation. We should educate them by tens, hundreds and thousands, and so give back to India the possibilities of active commercial life. Along that line intellectual Education should go, so that India may be what she really should be, a nation with all sides of the national life fully developed. Look at your national life now and you will see how partial it is, how one-sided it is, and how wanting it is in the manifold activities which are necessary for a great nation.

My fourth word was "spiritually". In India things have gone from bad to worse in this connection. Government colleges teach no religion at all; the missionary colleges teach a religion which is alien to the spirit and genius of the country. The boy has to

choose between no religious teaching at all, and the teaching of a religion which is different from his own. That is the worst defect of Education in India, and see how dangerous it becomes. The late Bishop of Calcutta, taking advantage of there being no religious Education of the Indian youth, tried to persuade the Government to introduce into all schools religious teaching based on the Bible, *i.e.*, on Christian lines. Fortunately that attempt has failed, because popular feeling was roused by it, and the plan was seen to be dangerous. If every religious community gave religious Education to its children, if the Hindu community afforded Hindu religious instruction, if the Mussalmans gave instruction in the faith of Islam, if the Parsis gave instruction in the Zoroastrian religion, and so on, leaving Christianity to be taught to the Christians only, then the religious Education of the country would proceed along proper and healthy lines. Again, it is not just to blame Government for want of religious Education. Government cannot give it, and it ought not to give it, lest it should infringe the religious neutrality on which the peace of India depends. Government is pledged to "no religious interference". Government must not do it; you ought to do it yourselves. Every community here should take up the question of religious Education. Now two of the great communities in India, the Hindus and the Mussalmans, are beginning to deal effectively with the question of religious Education. The Mussalmans have set an example in this direction by the foundation of their college at Aligarh. The Hindus are following in the same important path by the foundation of the Central Hindu College at Benares. You have thus two educational institutions for the two communities, that is, for two hundred and fifty millions of Hindus, and something like fifty or sixty millions of Mussalmans!

It is but a drop in the ocean, a grain of sand on the sea-shore. Nevertheless it is a beginning.

Now let me turn for a moment to the Central Hindu College, so that I may show you that the theory which I have been putting before you is not simply a theory, but is being carried out in practice. I am not so familiar with the workings in the Aligarh College, and therefore cannot speak definitely of that College. As regards the Hindu College, it was supposed, before we began to work, that the question of religious and moral Education was a thorny one; when we began we were told: "You cannot teach religion, because there will be endless sectarian troubles; you will have complaints from the parents of all the youths; it is impossible to teach religion to all the boys." We have not found it impossible, for every day in the College hall the boys gather together listening to the chant of the *Bhagavad-Gita*; they also listen to a Pandit expounding some doctrine with some moral illustration from the stories from the *Ramayana*, from the *Mahabharata*, and from the *Puranas*. Where is the Hindu who would object to such moral instruction? Then two or three boys (they take it in turn, so that all may have an opportunity) come forward, and, standing, facing their schoolfellows, chant together some *stotra* full of religious feeling and moral instruction. Where is the Hindu who would withdraw his boy from the teaching given in that College? That is not all that we have done. We have now taken a further step. We have issued two out of a series of three text-books, and the third will be issued about the end of this month or the beginning of the next. These books give a clear and definite outline of Hindu doctrines, Hindu ceremonies and Hindu ethics. The first is a little catechism, meant for little boys and

girls in the Primary Standards. The second is meant for the middle and upper classes in the High Schools. The third, which will soon be out, is for students in the Colleges. On this third book, of which the others are simplifications, have been obtained the opinions of the leading men in the Hindu community, both orthodox and liberal; we asked them to read and criticise it, and after making any necessary additions or omissions, to send it back corrected. This was done, and we have thus a general consensus of opinion of the leading men of different shades of opinion, endorsing this textbook. It has been a laborious work, and has taken two-and-a-half years altogether in order to complete it. But what are two-and-a-half years in the national life, if you can thus give to the nation what it wants in religious instruction? Now, all those who want to introduce religious teaching have the means ready to their hands. The Indian States are readily taking this series up, one after another, and are introducing religious instruction in the State schools. Some of the leading Princes in India are co-operating in this righteous work. Wherever there is a private college or school under Hindu management, there these textbooks should be introduced and used as guides for teaching. There is one difficulty, about the teacher. We want men who can teach rightly and in an interesting way, and not merely Pandits who will deal with questions of grammar and with the niceties of the commentators. This is one of our needs. Now what the Hindu community has done, others should do. The Parsi community should provide their children with a similar series of textbooks. The Mussalman and other communities should also supply their children with a similar series of textbooks. I fancy that perhaps it would be possible for each community to take the outlines of the moral

teaching from our series of textbooks, and only change the quotations and stories. We have given quotations from the Shastras, supporting morality from the Hindu books, but morality is the same for the Parsis as for the Hindus. The Parsis should give quotations from their own sacred literature. Morality again is the same for the Mussalmans as for the Hindus and the Parsis. The Mussalmans should support it by quotations from *Al Quran.* The various quotations from the scriptures of different religions would all support the same virtues. I think if that were done, that you would begin to build the Indian nation which we so earnestly desire to have. It does not seem quite impossible that, if we give these moral teachings on similar lines, we may gradually build up in the country a body which will gradually weld itself into an Indian nation.

Moreover, I hope to see, in days to come, a Mussalman University growing out of the Aligarh College, and a Hindu University growing out of the Benares College, so that these Universities may lead the national life of India, as the Oxford and Cambridge Universities lead the national life of England. I say that it is not impossible, if only all of you will take interest in the matter, and look on it as your own affair and as your own business.

There is one other point which I want to put before you. We have one peculiar thing in the Hindu College. Every boy who comes into the English department is obliged to learn Sanskrit. We have also a Pathashala, and every boy who comes to join it is obliged to learn English, so that the English-educated boys have to know Sanskrit, and the Sanskrit-educated boys have to know English. This is a great innovation. You may say: Why do you do it? Do you not see that there are two Hindu nations

in this land—one of Pandits, profound in their learning, scholarship, thought and knowledge, but knowing nothing outside Sanskrit literature. They know nothing of modern thought, modern life, the modern spirit. On the other side there is a Hindu nation growing up, knowing nothing of Sanskrit literature and of the sacred Books, growing up utterly Westernised. There is a great gulf between them and the nation of Pandits. The Pandit cannot influence the English-educated boy, because he does not sympathise with him in his hopes and aspirations. You cannot influence the young unless you sympathise and feel with them. We want to bridge the gulf between these Hindu nations, and we build this double bridge of Sanskrit and English. We lead both classes over it, so that both shall know English and both know Sanskrit; we thus hope to join the two Hindu nations and make them one in the service of their Motherland.

That is the work that we are carrying on in Benares, and I venture to say that it is a work in which every good Hindu should take the keenest interest, I want you all to think of us and to give us your goodwill. I want you to make a public opinion, which will enable the Benares College to grow into a University, and to have daughter colleges in all the great cities in the land, where the students will learn Hindu religion and Western culture, and will know the West without becoming aliens from their ancestral faith. It is the mightiest enterprise for which I ask your sympathy, your goodwill and your financial aid. I know that it will succeed, because the blessings of the great Ones are on it. I know it will succeed, because it is for the benefit of the future of India, which is at the heart of every one of us. But that future depends on Indians, and on no other

people and on no other country. The Indian nation will not grow by the influence of any other nation, but by the growth of character within India's own boundary. England can never make you free. You can only make yourselves free by becoming noble and upright, brave and true. Nations made of such men *must* be free. Your destiny lies in your own hands. Your future is to be of your creating. You must build the basis of noble character, and of the public spirit which shows itself in true citizenship. You must prove yourselves worthy to be a part of a mighty Empire. As Lord George Hamilton has rightly said, India must be governed on the basis of Indian feelings, Indian traditions, Indian thought and Indian ideas. That is true. It is possible that if India only grows up to the height of her possibilities, the time will come when she will send her best and noblest counsellors to take their part in a great Imperial Council, gathered round the Monarch for the ruling of the Empire. I dream of a time when India will help to build the Empire with that genius for statesmanship and clear insight which are found from time to time in great Indian ministers. These qualities will be utilised for the good of the Empire, for the good of the mighty whole of which India is a part. The times are gone by for small nations, for petty States, and for little peoples. The tendency now is towards raising a vast realm, united by common aims and common love. India in the future should aid to build such an Empire, should help to bear its burdens and share its responsibilities. I dream of a time when India, England, Australasia and Canada will all join hands in the making of a common Empire, when India's children will bring their priceless treasures to the enriching of that Empire. But for this her children must first build their character, for without that they will never be able to accomplish aught.

THE EDUCATION OF HINDU YOUTH[1]

No more important question can occupy the attention of a nation than that of the education of the youth of both sexes, for, as the immediate future lies in the hands of those who are now children, the direction of the national development depends on the training given to these embryo men and women. If they be brought up materialistically without any care being bestowed on their spiritual or moral culture, the nation as a whole must become materialistic, for the nation of the morrow is in the schools and homes of to-day.

What is the education necessary to give us spiritual, intellectual, moral, wisely progressive Hindu men and women, to form teachers, statesmen, merchants, producers, fathers, mothers, worthy to take part in the formation of a great Indian Nation? Such is the question we must answer. Let us take separately the school education of boys and girls, remembering, however, that their joint education in the home, from the cradle onwards, should come from the example and the lips of fathers and mothers who are themselves full of spirituality, thus forming a spiritual atmosphere which shall permeate the dawning mind. No after-training can compensate for the lack of religion in the home, the saturation of children's minds and hearts with pure religion and with the exquisite stories with which Indian literature abounds—tales of heroism, devotion, self-sacrifice, compassion, love, reverence. A man should not be able to remember a time when he was not familiar

[1] **From the *Theosophist* of March, 1897.**

with the melodious names of Indian Saints and Heroes, both men and women. But we are concerned with the education given in the schools, and first with that of the boys.

Boys of the upper classes must, under the circumstances of the day, receive an English education. Without this they cannot gain a livelihood and it is idle to kick against facts we cannot change. We can take the English education, then, for granted. But a reform in the books they study is necessary, and an effort should be made to substitute a detailed knowledge of Indian history and geography for the excessive amount of foreign history and geography now learned. A sound and broad knowledge of universal history widens the mind and is necessary for culture, but every man should know in fuller detail the history of his own nation, as such knowledge not only conduces to patriotism, but also enables a sound judgment to be formed as to the suitability of proposed changes to the national genius. Again, no book should be admitted to the school curriculum that treats the Hindu religion and Gods with the contempt born of ignorance. Hindu fathers have permitted their sons to be taught English from a book which states that "Shri Krishna was a profligate and a libertine". Such a sentence is an outrage, and poisons the minds of the boys reading it. The books used should be classical English works, read as literature, or elementary books of a purely secular character, or, still better, prepared by Hindus thoroughly conversant with English and imbued with reverence for religion. Stories from the *Mahabharata* and the *Ramayana*, well translated, should form reading books both in English and in the vernaculars. In teaching science vigilance must be exerted to shut out many of the ways in which some branches

of science are taught in Europe. No experiments on living animals should be permitted; they brutalise the heart and generally mislead the intellect. Reverence for life, compassion and tenderness to all sentient beings, should be inculcated in the school, by precept and example.

Moral education should form part of the curriculum. Daily, in every class, a brief portion of some sacred book should be read and explained, and its moral lessons enforced by illustrations; their bearing on individual, family, social and national life should be shown, and the evil results of their opposed vices should be expounded. Occasion should be taken with the elder youths to explain the scientific basis—the basis in nature—on which moral precepts are founded and to point out the wisdom of Hindu religious practices. They will thus acquire an intelligent appreciation of the value of religion and morality.

Sanskrit should be a compulsory subject in every school, as Latin is in European schools. It is the mother of many Indian vernaculars and of Pali; all the greatest treasures of Indian literature are enshrined in it, and a knowledge of it should be a necessary part of the education of every Indian gentleman. Such a knowledge should also serve as a national bond, for a common language is one of the strongest elements in nationality.

It is grotesque that English should be made the common language of the educated Indians instead of their own rich, flexible, and musical Sanskrit. But it must be taught in the modern way, that a competent knowledge of it, sufficient for reading and conversation, may be acquired in the short time available for learning it. The fashion in which it was taught in more leisurely ages is not suitable to the needs of the

time, and even if it be still used for the training of specialists, it can never be adopted as part of the curriculum in modern education. To insist on teaching it only in the old way is to doom Sanskrit to extinction as a living language universally known by educated Indians.

It is, further, exceedingly important that English should be introduced into Sanskrit Schools in which Pandits are trained. For the growing gulf between English-educated Indians, who know no Sanskrit, and the Pandits who know no English, is a danger alike to religious and national life. These two classes understand each other and sympathise with each other less and less; and the legitimate influence which religious men should wield over worldly men is an ever-diminishing factor in the national life of India. These classes must be drawn nearer together, and this object will largely be gained by all educated men knowing Sanskrit, and all Pandits, the Sanskrit specialists, knowing English and being a little more in touch with Western thought. A course of Western philosophy should form part of a Pandit's education and it would make him all the better able to appreciate and defend the unrivalled philosophic systems in his own literature. Indian thought has influenced the thought of the world, and the effects of this influence should be known and appreciated by those who are its natural custodians. Men, to influence the world, must be in touch with it, and the Pandits are, with each generation, becoming less and less in touch with it, and more and more isolated from their educated countrymen.

The difficulty of making Sanskrit part of the necessary education of every gentleman is much overrated. Every Muhammadan gentleman knows Arabic, and can read the Koran. Why should the Hindu be more backward in reading the Vedas? To be ignorant of

the language in which all his religious ceremonies are performed is to be doomed to irreligion or to unintelligent religion, and such ignorance should be regarded as disgraceful to a man claiming to be educated. The spread of Sanskrit knowledge would increase the printing and publishing of Sanskrit works and open up honourable occupation as Sanskrit teachers to large numbers of Pandits—if they would consent to teach in a modern way—and thus many collateral benefits would accrue to India by this addition to the regular school curriculum.

Hindu boarding-houses should be established wherever there are school and college students who come from a distance, and these should be conducted on religious lines; the boys being taught there to observe their religious duties as if living in the atmosphere of a religious Indian home. Here again Muhammadans are ahead of us in their care for the religious training of the young, for such Muhammadan boarding-houses are found near colleges attended by Muhammadan students, whereas Hindu boys are ruthlessly exposed to purely secular or even proselytising influences at the very time when they are most impressible. Are there no wealthy Hindus who care enough for their faith and their country to help in the care and protection of the young?

Let us turn to the education of girls, the future wives and mothers of Hindus, those on whom the welfare of the family, and therefore largely the welfare of the nation, depends. Until the last two or three generations the education of Hindu girls was by no means neglected. They were trained in religious knowledge and were familiar with the great Indian epics and with much of the Puranas, to say nothing of the vernacular religious literature. They would learn by heart thousands of lines of

these, and would also have stored in their memory many *stotras*. Hence their children were cradled in an atmosphere full of devotion, fed on sacred songs and stories. Further, they were thoroughly trained in household economy, in the management of the house, and the knowledge of the duties of dependents and servants. They were skilled in medicine and were the family doctors, and many were highly skilled in artistic needlework and music. Their education was directed to fit them to discharge their functions in life, to render them competent to fulfil the weighty duties belonging to them in Indian family life. This "old-fashioned education" has now almost entirely disappeared, and the present generation is for the most part singularly incompetent and helpless, too often trivial and childish, unable to train sons and daughters in the noble [illegible] and dignity of true Hindu life.

To remedy this admitted deterioration, attempts are being made to introduce "female education," but unhappily, the kind of education mostly essayed, being founded on the needs of Western life, is mischievous rather than beneficial to Indian womanhood. To introduce a system suited to one country into another where the social conditions are entirely different is to act blindly and foolishly, without any consideration of the objects education is intended to subserve. Education should fit the person educated for the function he or she is to discharge in later life; if it fail to do this, it may be book-learning but it is not education.

Now the higher education of women in England and America is mainly directed to fitting women to compete with men as bread-winners in the various professions and Government employment. Very large numbers of women of gentle birth are compelled by the present condition of English and American society

to go out into the world to earn their own living. Owing to many causes—among them the tendency of young Englishmen to go abroad as colonists and settlers; the prevalence of widow marriage, so that one woman may have two or three husbands in succession; the greater mortality among males—there is a large surplus of unmarried women. When a man marries, he leaves the family home, and makes a new home for his wife and himself; hence when the parents die, the unmarried daughters are then thrown homeless on the world and have to go out to earn a living. Under these circumstances, having to compete with highly educated men, they require an education similar in kind to that hitherto restricted to men; otherwise they would compete at a hopeless disadvantage and would receive very poor salaries. Women are now educated at High-Schools and Colleges on the same lines as men, and compete with them at examinations, as they do later in working life. They become doctors, professors, clerks, and in America they also practise at the Bar and are ordained as ministers of religion.

Needless to say that in India there is no prospect of such a complete revolution in social life as would break up the family system, drive the women out into the world to earn bread and make them competitors with men in every walk of life. The province of women in India is still the home; such a thing as an unmarried girl is scarcely known, and the joint family system offers a secured shelter to every girl and woman of the family. Their life is a family life; of what avail then to waste the years during which they should be educated to play their part well in the family, in giving them an education suited for Western social life but entirely unsuited to their own? The school-life of the

girl in India must necessarily be brief, and it is therefore the more important that she should spend that brief time to the best possible advantage. Of what possible value can it be to her to know all about the Wars of the Roses and the dates of the great English battles? How much is she the better for learning Latin? Of what value to her is it to pass the Matriculation Examination? Why should ordinary Indian girls have a detailed knowledge of English geography, while ordinary English girls are never taught details of Indian geography—for the sufficient reason that it would not be of any use to them? The Indian girl should learn to read and write her vernacular, and the books used should for the most part be translations from the most attractive Sanskrit books, the great epics and dramas of her country. The course of reading mapped out should give her an elementary acquaintance with Indian literature, history and geography, serving as a basis for future study. It might also, in the higher classes, include the broad outlines of universal history and geography and of the greatest literary masterpieces of foreign nations. She should be given a sound knowledge of arithmetic so continually needed by the manager of the household. She should be taught thoroughly the "science of common life," the value of food-stuffs, the necessary constituents of a healthy diet, the laws of health of the body; and for the house she should be thoroughly instructed in medicinal botany, the preparation and use of herbs, the treatment of all simple forms of disease, of simple surgical cases, and of accidents of various kinds. In the higher classes Sanskrit should be taught, so that the vast stores of the noble literature of India should be opened to her daughters. A knowledge of music, including playing on the *vina* and singing, is most desirable, as well as a thorough acquaintance with

such needlework as is wanted in the home; the teaching of artistic needlework is also useful, forming a pleasant recreation. At present, in some schools, the hideous "samplers," long since discarded in English school teaching, with their crude colours and impossible animals, are being produced. The exquisite Indian embroidery should, of course, take the place of these, with its delicately shaded gradations of colour and its graceful forms. These train the eye and the taste which are demoralised by the other kind of work. But above all else must the Indian girl be trained in the devotion and piety to which her nature so readily responds. Not only should she read, but she should learn by heart, stories and poems from the best Indian literature, *stotras* and sacred verses. No girl should leave school without becoming familiar with the *Bhagavad Gita*, and knowing much, if not all of it, by heart. All the great heroines of Indian story should be made familiar to her, with their inspiring example and elevating influence. The Indian ideal of womanhood should be made living to her in these heroic figures, and she should be taught to regard them as her exemplars in her own life. With heart thus trained and memory thus stored, she will be fit to be the "Lakshmi of the house," and the hearts of husband and children will safely trust in her. Girls thus educated will make the Indian home what it ought to be—the centre of spirituality, the strength of the national religious life. Among them we may hope to see revived the glories of the past, the tenderness and fidelity of Sita and Savitri, the intellectual grandeur of Gargi, the all-sacrificing spirituality of Maitreyi.

If the Indian youth could be educated on these or similar lines, India's future among the nations would be secured, a future not unworthy of her past—spiritually, morally, intellectually and materially great.

THE NECESSITY FOR RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.[1]

It is my wish to put before you very plainly and clearly why I believe that religion must be an essential part of all education which is worth the name, why boys should desire it, why teachers should impart it. I propose to set before you certain definite reasons, appealing to your intelligence, why the future of your lives and the future of your country depend chiefly, primarily, on the inclusion of religion in your education, reasons which may impel you, if religious teaching is not already given to you, to earnestly demand it at the hands of those who are responsible for your training. For if the professors in our colleges, the masters of our schools, are so little sensible of the dignity of their high office as to submit to the exclusion of religion from education, degrading education from a preparation for citizenship in this and other worlds to a mere commercial speculation, then must the parents and guardians of students, and the students themselves, imperatively demand that the most important factor in true education should not be omitted therefrom. The law of the State punishes the careless parent who allows his child's body to starve, the law of Karma punishes the thoughtless parent who allows his child's spiritual nature to be stunted by the withholding of religion.

[1] A lecture delivered to the Students' Literary Society of Madras, on February 26th, 1908.

I am not going to-day to repeat the well worn arguments drawn from observations of other countries, showing how nations rise as they make religion a part of education, and how they sink as they pronounce an unhallowed divorce between the Spirit and the intellect of man. From those observations, India may well draw a lesson for her own guidance, as in truth she may also draw it from the story of her own past. For when she was mightiest in peace and war, when her industry was most productive and her commerce most enriching, she was then, above all else, a religious nation, and religion interpenetrated every action of her family, her social, her political life.

But to-day I speak to you on other lines, and appeal, not to observations on which you may base conclusions, but rather to your reason itself. Along three lines my arguments will run: first, Religion is necessary as the basis for Morality; secondly, Religion is necessary as the inspiration of Art; thirdly, Religion is necessary as the foundation of original Literature. If these three positions can be established and maintained, then is Religion necessary for the greatness of a nation, for what kind of a nation can you have without Morality, without Art, without Literature?

First, then, *Religion is necessary as the basis for Morality.*—When you are teaching the duty of doing the right and avoiding the wrong, when you are trying to persuade people to be virtuous, when you are arguing that a man without civic virtues, a man who is not a good father in the family, a good citizen in the State, is not a man who can help in making a nation great and prosperous, you are apt to be asked in a sort of general way: "Why cannot we teach moral duties by themselves, why cannot we teach men to be truthful and brave, why cannot we teach

them to do their duty and to serve their countr) without appealing to religion, which is very, ver often the cause of turmoil and dissension, which it i desirable to keep in the background rather than dra' to the front ?"

The answer to that is that, in teaching moralit) you must base your precept, to do or not to do, o some principle recognised by those whom you addres: It is not enough to say to a man who is eager to amas money, whose one idea of success is the gathering o a great fortune: "You ought to be honest, you ough to be fair, you ought not to cheat, you ought not t take unfair advantage of your rivals in trade." H will turn round upon you and say: "Why? Wh should I be honest and fair? Why should I not tak what advantage I can of others by my cleverer brain if I just avoid coming into contact with the law, an if these unfair ways help me in gaining my object?' You require something on which your "ought" ca find a footing, a basis for your moral precepts.

Three bases of morality have been offered by th great thinkers of the world. One school base morality on Intuition; the second bases it on Utility the third bases it on Religion. Let us examine eac in turn.

The first school bases morality on Intuition, alleging that a man knows by his own nature that he ough to do the right, that he ought not to do the wrong that there is in every man's heart an inner witnes which is called Conscience, and which is the voice o God in the human soul; this conscience, it is argued should be taken as the foundation for morality, and to its guidance a nation may safely commit the moral direction of its young. The answer to this is that conscience is a very variable quantity, differing among

different nations, among different communities, varying with the varied stages of evolution, useful only amid accustomed conditions, and failing when applied to new problems.

It is a truism to remark that some of the most evil actions the world has known have been due to conscience. The Spanish inquisition was founded and carried on by men who conscientiously believed that they were serving God by the torturing and burning of heretics, that they wielded the surgeon's knife to cut out from the bosom of society the cancer of heresy, not the brigand's knife to mutilate and murder. There is truth, though truth brutally expressed, in the answer of the Anglican archbishop to a Puritan who pleaded his conscience in defence of his rebellion against the dictum of the Church: "Verily, thou mayest be acting according to thy conscience; but thou shouldst take care that thy conscience is not the conscience of a fool." That a man should act according to his conscience is right for him, but it by no means follows that his conscientious act is right. By his errors, his conscience is instructed, and he learns to avoid pitfalls in the future by the sufferings caused by his conscience flinging him into pitfalls in the present. Out of the pains resulting from his conscientious wrong actions, is made the ladder by which he climbs to wisdom. Why this is so, we shall see in a moment.

The average conscience of the members of a community, as manifested in its public opinion, is behind, not in advance of, the best ethical thought of its time. The conscience of average men allows them to do very many things of which a man of noble character will say: "That is against my conscience"; the average conscience is far below that of the greatest thinkers, of the purest saints, of the noblest men of

the time. The common average conscience is embodied in the law, and this stamps as criminal the acts which are reprobated at the stage of evolution reached by the large majority of the community. But there are many vices, many evils, which the law is unable to touch. The vices which corrupt the trade and commerce of a country, which rot its commercial honesty, and slowly sap its prosperity, are vices which no law can arrest or punish. Operations on stock exchanges, by which a few clever men reduce to misery numbers of foolish and ignorant people, is a form of robbery which causes far more suffering than burglary, but the law cannot check it. Public morality condones it, even courts the highly successful destroyer, and society smiles on the financier whose operations are on a sufficiently large scale to secure millions, though well knowing that by no morally legitimate means can such gains be heaped together. This shifting, developing, faculty of conscience is no sure foundation for the building of morality.

For what is conscience ? It is true that it exists in all save the very undeveloped, but it is only the result of the experience of the past of each individual, and varies with that experience. In past lives, in past births, each man has learned by experience that certain lines of conduct lead to happiness, while others lead to misery. Slowly and gradually, in all the lives that lie behind you, your experience has shaped itself into definite judgments, and with the tendency to follow these judgments, you are born. And as the experiences of each differ from those of others in details, so each man's conscience differs slightly from that of his neighbour; and as the total experiences of people, at about the same stage of evolution, have their broad outlines in common, so men at about the

same grade have broadly similar consciences. And as the experiences that lie behind great men are more numerous, more varied, more rich, than those which lie behind the average man, so are their consciences more highly developed than the consciences of their less developed neighbours. In general morality, you can appeal effectively only to the average conscience, the average moral sense of the hearers; you cannot draw from them a response to the verdict of a more highly evolved conscience, nor impose its decision upon them, any more than you can obtain from a violin string a note higher than that which is yielded by the most rapid vibrations which it is capable of producing. Conscience grows with civilisation, with knowledge, with the increasing number of lives; it is quickened by training, by education, by contact with the more highly developed. But not on the shifting sands of conscience can morality be founded. Not from its many-voiced opinions can a categorical imperative be drawn.

Let us turn to Utility, and see whether that can yield us the basis which we need. Of the school which advocates this as a basis, the maxim is: That which conduces to the happiness of the greatest number is right. Many of the most thoughtful people in the West, many philosophers and sociologists, are to be found in this school, and they argue that Utility is the only reliable basis of morality. They argue that you can discover what is right by a study of human experience, by tracing out the results of various lines of conduct. The conduct that results in happiness is right; that which results in misery is wrong. In this there is a great truth; right conduct, in the long run, brings happiness; wrong conduct, in the long run, brings misery. That which brings about universal happiness—not the

happiness of the greatest number only—is right; but a result is not a basis, and while the Right leads ultimately to universal Bliss, the bliss is so distant, and the immediate results of right action are often so painful to the right doer, that the imperative which is based on Utility fails to win allegiance, save from the noblest and the most unselfish, those who need least a moral law outside them, being, in truth, a law unto themselves. William Kingdon Clifford, a famous mathematical and scientific thinker, and one of the noblest and purest of men, spoke in most eloquent and moving language upon the duty that lay upon every man and woman to pay back to the society of the present the debt they owed to the society of the past. He urged that all the advantages into which we are born, the brains which have been moulded by the thoughts of unnumbered generations, the social order evolved by the efforts of the countless thinkers, statesmen, rulers, labourers, the wealth piled up by innumerable toilers—all these are not of our making, but are the gifts of the dead to the living, and should be handed on increased, enriched, as the gifts of the living to the yet unborn. Every one of us, he argued, was protected, guarded, educated, nurtured, by the whole past humanity, the results of whose labours were summed up in social organisation, in civil order, in the laws of nations, in the comity of peoples. Receiving so much as the accumulations of the past, we were bound, by honour and honesty, to add to those accumulations the results of our own labours, and so bequeath to posterity a larger and richer legacy. He declared that those who would not work for the future, who did not feel and discharge the obligations incurred by receiving benefits from the past, were men and women unworthy, degraded, unfit heirs of the splendid legacy of the past. Such an appeal stirs to its depth

every noble spirit, and the highly-unfolded mind and heart respond to it in every fibre of their being, but it leaves cold and unmoved the average man of our time. I remember how, in a splendid lecture delivered by Charles Bradlaugh, he expressed himself on this with burning eloquence. Answering the statement that a man would not do right unless he looked for a personal reward, for an immortal happiness on the other side of death, he repudiated the idea with all the passionate indignation of a man on fire with love for humanity, with all the beauty of his magnificent oratory. It was not necessary, he cried, to appeal to human selfishness in order to inspire man to the achievement of noble deeds. "Enough for me, if the great citadel of truth, into which I may not enter, shall have its possession by humanity made the nearer because I have fought; enough for me, if my body, falling into the moat which surrounds that castle, helps to make the bridge over which mankind shall march to victory." There is no doubt of the splendour of that conception. There is no doubt of the greatness of the soul which could find sufficient reward for sacrifice, for suffering, for renunciation, in the hope that in the future, when he was dead, when nothing—as he firmly believed—remained of him, when his life had vanished as a blown-out flame, as the brightness of rusted steel, the world would be a little nearer to happiness because in the past he had struggled, because he had lived.

But how few there are who, by such a hope, could be inspired to a life as heroic as was his. Only the world's great ones can live nobly, upheld by such a thought. The average man remains cold before the appeal for posterity's welfare. He says in act what a witty Frenchman said in word: "What has posterity done for me, that I should work for

posterity?" If he repudiates his obligation to pay to the future the debt contracted by his receipts of benefits from the past, what moral law can utter an imperative that he will recognise as cogent, a command that he will feel compelled to obey? The weakness of the utilitarian basis lies in the fact that your imperative fails, save where you appeal to the noble-minded, to those who need it least. These respond to it, but others shrug their shoulders, and care not for the welfare of the race. The present pain to be incurred by themselves is not, for them, balanced by a future welfare in which they will not partake, and the slight ill-doing of the present, bringing to them a personal gain, is not checked by the idea that it injects a moral poison into the shadowy bodies of generations yet unborn.

If Intuition fails as a basis for morality, if Utility, devoid of immortality, also fails us, we are forced to our third basis—Religion.

In most countries of the world, religion has been made the basis of morality, for the founders of religion were occultists, who understood the nature of men, who intended religion to guide their evolution, and who, knowing that the motives which appealed to men at one stage, failed to appeal to them at another, graded their teachings to suit the grade in evolution of their hearers. In each great religion, the sayings of its founder, his precepts, his commands, have been accepted as the moral law of his people. The Jew obeys the laws of Moses; the Christian bows to the sayings of Jesus, although—owing to the fact that His esoteric teachings became exoteric—he ignores those which he regards as impracticable in the life of the world; the Hindu looks back to Manu as his lawgiver; the Buddhist accepts the precepts of the Enlightened One, the

Buddha; the Musalman sees in the teachings of his Prophet the rule of his conduct. In each of these religions the moral law comes from an authority divinely commissioned, or is itself regarded as divine, the law which the believer must obey. The world has grown up along these lines. The morality of the nations of the world has been fed from the breasts of their religions. Religions have yielded the categorical imperative necessary for the moral education of mankind. These have used praises and threats, rewards and punishments, suited to the age and intelligence of their adherents. Ignorance may have distorted the sure sequences of moral law into a rewarding and avenging deity; ignorance may have prolonged a term into an everlastingness, and have distorted the self-made scourges of passions into the fire and brimstone and fiends of hells. The sure truths of nature and of natural sequences may have been twisted by ignorant and self-seeking priesthoods for the terrorising of the simple and the timid. But none the less have the religions of the world trained their believers into a practical and useful morality, by which nations have been builded, civilisation has been rendered possible, and a social order has been secured. It has been said in mockery, but the saying embodies a truth, that religions have been the police of society. And, however much modern sentimentality may shrink from it, fear is one of the motives which curb the strong and the oppressive, and spread a shield over the otherwise defenceless victims of their greed.

But now, for the first time, the very basis of religion has been undermined; its authority has been challenged, its ancient world-scriptures rent in pieces. More and more insistently the sceptical intellect of man is asking: "Why should I obey? Where is the

justification for your claim to authority?" The critical reason is demanding a sure basis for a compelling power, a categorical imperative which can be enforced by logic and by an appeal to undeniable facts. Such a basis is to be found only in that supreme fact of nature which is asserted alike by revelation, by philosophy and by science—before the unity of the Self, the one life universal clothed in an illimitable diversity of forms. Dr. Miller has truly said that the great gifts of Hinduism to the world are the teachings of the Immanence of God and the solidarity of mankind. But every religion has taught these great truths more or less clearly, has proclaimed them in language more or less definite, according to the intelligence of the people to whom they were addressed. Hinduism has taught them with supreme lucidity, because its religion and its philosophy were shaped by occultists addressing the subtlest and keenest brains that humanity has yet evolved.

The unity of the Self—that, and that only, is the sure foundation for morality, the rock which can never be shaken, the basis which no logic can impugn, which experience continually re-verifies. The Unity of Life—revelation proclaims it, philosophy demands it, science affirms it. The ancient truth, the Truth of truths, intuited by the Pure Reason, is being ever more insistently asserted and demonstrated by science. Experiment confirms what intuition and reason demand, and no surer guarantee of truth is attainable by humanity. On this irrefragable, impregnable Truth, may morality be built surely and fearlessly! It is the Rock of Ages, eternal, stable, secure.

Many names are given by the different religions to this sure fact. Some say, God, the universal Father, and mankind, His children; some say, the one Self

dwelling in the heart of all; some say, the Life Universal, the all in all, the source of being and of beings. Names matter nothing; they are all but labels for one fact, the Unity.

We are all one in the unity of the universal life, we are all one in the unity of the Self, who knows no "other". But if you and I are one, one Life, one Self, though in two forms, then if I injure you, I injure myself; if I lie to you, I am lying to myself, and the lie will deceive me and I shall fall; if I cheat you, I am cheating myself, and that cheating will defraud me, and I shall suffer. I cannot get away from you. I cannot separate myself from you. We appear as two, but one life unites us, and the blow that I aim at you inflicts pain on myself. This is the truth which, denied, asserts itself as pain; which, accepted and lived by, reveals itself as bliss. This is the law which destroys civilisations which ignore it, which crushes into fragments, into dust, every society which refuses to obey it. It has destroyed scores of civilisations, and only a civilisation built upon it shall endure.

So is every community, every nation, one body, a smaller within the larger Self. It is in verity, not only in name, a body politic, and there is a real unity in a nation's life. If men pour into that national life, cowardice, and lies, and cheating, and knavery, the whole nation is poisoned, the vitality of the nation is lowered, and good men and evil men alike suffer from the common ill. A nation is so truly constituted as one body, that its evil-doers poison the life-blood of that body, and all the citizens suffer, for all share the national life. The whole morality of the nation is lowered by the presence in it of a number of dishonest men, whether their dishonesty be legally punishable or not. They spread through the nation like a subtle

poison, for we cannot be separated the one from the other, since we are all clothed in one matter, and are all living by one life.

Nor can injustice be done to one part of the nation, without the rest of the nation suffering. All nations have a degraded class of people belonging to them, in whose persons the Unity of the Self is outraged. In England this class is called "the submerged tenth," and it is a continual disgrace and peril to the nation, a constant menace to the stability of the State. Here also is a similar class of people, though not degraded to the same point of brutality as in England—the class called the Panchamas, or Pariahs, or outcastes. Some five and a half millions of these people are living on Indian soil, the remnants of the conquered aborigines of the country, submerged by the waves of the Aryan conquerors. For many generations you have sought to push these people away, to keep them separate, and have thought: "I can get rid of these inferior people, I can keep them out of those among whom I move: I will not allow them to come into my house; they shall go off the road on which I am walking." True, you can turn your backs on the outcaste people, and deny in them practically the presence of the all-pervading Self, the presence which you pride yourself on acknowledging in words. But what happens? The enemies of your faith take pity on them. Christian missionaries go to them, and turn them into Christians. Muhammadans go to them, and say: "Come into Islam; we shall treat you as brothers, and not as outcastes." The Christian missionary allures them, the Mussalman allures them, with promises of better social conditions, and thus a vast population is turning against Hinduism, and threatens the stability of Hindu society. The very Hindus who refuse to allow them to enter their homes, allow them to enter when they are

Christians or Muhammadans, thus aiding to bribe them to turn against the religion to which they had naturally gravitated. Has this denial of the Unity of the Self profited the Aryan conquerors, or has not the karma of conquest and oppression worked itself out, has not Nemesis trodden on the heels of wrong? The Aryans who conquered the elder races, now, in their turn, are conquered by their youngers, and they are forced to drink of the bitter cup which they have held to other lips. The liberty they have denied to others is denied to them; the hospitality they refused to others is refused to them; the oppression wherewith they have oppressed others falls upon them, but in far smaller measure than hey meted out to the races they conquered.

My brothers, see in this hard lesson the working of the Unity of the Self, bringing oppression to the oppressor, loss of liberty to those who have denied it to others. You complain, and justly, of the harsh and rude manners often shown to you by your English rulers, but are they one-hundredth part as insolent to you, as you are insolent to this race whom you, in the past, brought under your yoke? If you would have courtesy from the conquerors, yield you courtesy to these, your conquered; if you would win liberty, give liberty to these, the down-trodden of many centuries; lift up these whom, in your pride, you have trodden under foot, and karma, ever just, will lift you up, and will return to you, in fullest measure, the blessings you have showered upon those whom you had wronged. It is not to the point that you are, intellectually and morally, the equals of your conquerors, while these people were an inferior, as well as a conquered race. Oppression is oppression, on whomsoever it is wrought; insolence is insolence, whether shown to high or low; the very fact that these were your

inferiors, helpless in your hands, rendered them the more worthy of your compassion, of your pity; it is the tears of the weak that rot the foundations of empires.

Thus do we see that Religion is the only sure foundation for morality, as the fundamental truth of Religion, the Unity of the Self, is that on which alone a science of ethics can be built. How, then, shall we venture to rob our boys and girls of this essential element in true education, casting them adrift on the ocean of life, without a chart to guide them, without a helm to steer?

Religion is the Inspiration of Art.—Many people do not consider, do not understand, how important is the part played by Art in the life of a nation, and how impossible it is for a nation to reach a full-orbed greatness unless Art plays its part in the shaping of the nation's growth. The Art of a nation is the expression of that nation's conception of the Beautiful, of its love of harmony, proportion and order. The Beautiful is that which refines and polishes a nation, gives it dignity and grace and self-restraint. Inevitably vulgar becomes the nation which has no true Art, in which passion begets no poesy, and love delights not in grace of outline, in splendour of colour. There, passion changes to brutality, and love puts on the hideous mask of lust. Study nature, alike in the masses with which she constructs a world, and in the details with which she crowds the smallest nook in her vast realms, and you will understand that one of the pillars on which the Great Architect of the Universe constructs His Universe is beauty.

India, the country whose life has everywhere been permeated by religion, has wrought beauty into the daily life of her people, and hence the refinement

which is the common possession of her children. Look at the vessels in daily use in an Indian home, in which Western influence has not vulgarised the ways of living, and you will find them all beautiful in form and colour; the kitchen utensils, the brass and pottery, would serve as ornaments of an English drawing-room; the women's dresses, the hangings, the carpets, are all lovely from an artistic standpoint; beauty meets you at every turn in the domestic life, a constant delight to the eye, a refining influence on every member of the household. Go into a country village, and you see the peasant woman draped in a sari exquisite in colour, falling in graceful folds round the erect and supple form; she bears on her head a brazen vessel of noble outline, or an earthen one of brownish-red, harmonising with the trees she passes, a veritable picture, though but a village lass or dame. That beauty of the life surroundings softens and mellows the life, and lends it a charm of dignity and grace which refines and educates.

But even into the village life the vulgarising influence is spreading, and sometimes the peasant woman going to the well, still wearing the graceful sari, still carrying her head with queenly dignity, bears on that head neither the brilliant brass, throwing back the glory of the sun-ray, nor the glowing red of the village potter's handiwork, but the stiffly outlined, unlovely kerosene oil tin. You may think it does not matter, but that is not so. It matters, because the subtly vulgarising and coarsening influence of the replacing of beauty by ugliness in common life drags the whole nation to a lower level. The peasants catch their colour from their environments, and the slouching, clumsy, round-shouldered walk of the English ploughman, in such striking

contrast to the springy, alert, erect gait of the Indian peasant, corresponds to the ugly, clumsy vessels of his cottage and his village ale-house. The English peasant of two centuries ago had also his things of beauty, his carven wooden vessels, and his well carved bench, as the Norwegian peasant has still. It is the advent of the age of machines that has cursed the country-side, and deteriorated the manhood of the English peasantry. Hence, in England, the most thoughtful people are trying to bring beauty back to the country life, to restore handicrafts, and to revive the arts which make common life beautiful. What William Morris and his followers have done for the middle classes, others are seeking to do for the poorer people, so that England may regain the beauty of the common life, the refinement and the grace lost in the coming of machinery and the passionate struggle for wealth. The early Victorian age in England is now a synonym for ugliness, and her manufacturers try to palm off upon Indian Princes the atrocities for which there is no longer sale among their English customers, thus degrading and vulgarising the once exquisite Indian taste.

There is nothing in nature untouched by man that has not its own beauty and its own grace. The forest depths and the mountain solitudes, the tossing waves of ocean and the shimmering ripples of the lake, the little out-of-the-way valley, cradled in the bosom of the hills and carpeted with flowers, the snow-clad peak, the brilliant blue and the summer noon, the dark star-spangled depths of midnight, the white radiance of the moon, the dancing shadows cast by the sunbeams—what are these but signs of the eternal beauty, the sign-manual of God? Nature, which is His expression in matter, in her contact

with the ugly and the formless, is ever moulding into new forms of beauty the chaotic matter which is the plastic material for her artist fingers. Beauty is a real power, and each religion, in its day of supremacy, has generated some great Art. The faith of Islam, conquering Northern India, gave to its new home the exquisite lines of the Taj Mahal, the beauty of the Pearl Mosque, the marvellous courts of the Delhi Palace; in Spain, the victorious Moors reared the splendour of the domed and minaretted Alhambra, and left the deathless memory of their art in Cordova, and in many an Andalusian city. In Greece, the massive but delicate lines of her architectural genius modelled buildings which modern Art reproduces, but fails to improve, and she sculptured marble with a skill and power that have made immortal the names of her artist sons. In Rome, her Art built with the strength of a Titan, and her temples, her pillars, her theatres, proclaim the majesty of her vanished past. In Egypt, her sombre religion bodied itself forth in grandiose and gloomy fanes, mighty in their power, impressive beyond all other architectural types. Christianity, in mediæval Europe, gave birth to the marvel of Gothic architecture, wherein the springing lines of pillar and arch seem to carry the soul upwards, as though it would climb the very heavens from the slender strength of the upward-soaring shaft. And who that has seen it can forget the glory of the Florence Duomo, where the green and rosy marbles have imprisoned the hues of the sunbeams, and, tier on tier, carven figures carry the charmed sight upward, till the crowning images are outlined against the blue of the Italian sky. Did not Christianity give to the world the canvases on which the brush of Raphael limned the immortal beauty of the Virgin and the Child, the marbles which the chisel of Michael Angelo carved

into the Lawgiver and the Laocoon? Everywhere has religion given birth to Art, the cult of the Beautiful, and faith has been the inspiration that gave life to the brush and the chisel. If our modern days have no great Art, it is because they have no might of faith. They copy, but they cannot create. And not until the great spiritual impulse now sweeping over the earth, that we call the Divine Wisdom, Theosophy, gives birth to a new ideal and conception of beauty, will the Art of the future be seen among us, the Art which shall be the expression of Beauty for our age. If you would preserve what is left of Indian Art, if you would create the Indian Art of the future, you must revive the religious spirit which is the mother of Art, you must welcome the latest—and the most ancient—expression of that spirit, Theosophy, the Supreme Science. Then, and then only will Indian ideals of Beauty draw again the hearts of mankind, and give through the most spiritual of religions, the highest expression of Art.

Religion is the foundation of great Literature.—Where religion is not an essential part of the education given to the youth of a nation, there the nation has no literature worthy to be called great. By "great" literature, I mean literature that is original, literature produced by the creative, as distinguished from the imitative, intelligence. Trace back your own literature, and you will see that its most splendid age was that which was profoundly religious. Hinduism inspired the Vedas with their Upanishads, wrote the ancient Puranas, lived, and then immortalised in deathless verse, the epics of the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*; from its fertile womb sprang the six great schools of philosophy, the science of Yoga, the ancient treatises on medicine, on grammar, and astronomy. These writings, which are the admiration

and the study of the foremost nations of the present day, for the depth and sublimity of their thought and the stateliness and beauty of their diction, were all flowers on the mighty tree of Indian religion. Later, as religion weakened, India had great commentators, great grammarians of the second order, great philologists; but these cannot raise a nation to the pinnacle of literary fame. Creative literature, not commentative and imitative literature—India is barren of that to-day. And she will never again become creative in her literature, any more than she will become exquisitely beautiful in her Art, until religion is incorporated in her education and her children grow to manhood within the inspiration of her faith. Nor is this fact confined to India. The great literature of Islam, philosophical and scientific, in Europe, grew out of Muhammadanism in the few centuries which succeeded the death of the mighty Arabian Prophet. The masterpieces of Christian literature were written in an atmosphere of religion; the Renaissance was the child of the Moorish teachers; the Elizabethan age followed the religious struggles of the Reformation. Everywhere history testifies to the close relationship between religion and literary genius.

And this is natural. For the nobler part of the human intellect is an aspect of the Spirit in man, and the lower mind contacts the spirit only as it is fed and nourished by religion. As that contact open the avenues to the spirit, the spirit shines down these avenues and illumines the mind. When the mind is illumined by the spirit, and the brain is able to respond to the swift and subtle vibrations of that mental world, then we have the radiant and splendid manifestation that man calls genius.

Thus great and imperative then, is the necessity for religion as an integral part of education.

Do not tell me that religious training may be given in the home, in voluntary classes, on special occasions. If you leave it out of education, you shut it out of life. The boys will learn the things which are in the educational curriculum, and will treat outside subjects of study with the same indifference that you show by placing them in an inferior rank—will treat them with indifference, if not with contempt. Nor will they turn in later life to the study ostracised in the school and the college. Then the world will have hardened them, then social ambition will have fettered them; the brains will be less plastic, the hearts less warm, than in the eager and passionate days of youth. Life's ideals must be wrought in the soft clay of youth, and they will harden into firm material with maturity. Train your boys and girls in religion, and then only will they become the men and the women that India needs.

See how the great men of your past were religious men. To take even modern times, see how Baber and Akbar were penetrated with the religious spirit. And, later yet, see Shivaji, bowing at the feet of his Guru, ere he drew the sword to free his native land.

Those of you who would have India great, those of you who would see her might, remember that the condition of national greatness is the teaching of religion to the young. Teach them to be religious, without being sectarian. Teach them to be devoted, without being fanatical Teach them to love their own faith, without decrying or hating the faiths of their fellow-citizens. Make religion a unifying force, not a separative; make religion a builder-up of nationality, not a disintegrator; make religion the fostering mother of civic virtues, the nurse and teacher of morality. Then shall the boys and girls grow up into the great citizens of the India that shall

be; then shall they live in an India, mighty, prosperous and free; then shall they look back with gratitude to those who, in the days of darkness, lifted up the light, and gave the religious teaching which alone makes good citizens and great men.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION[1]

THE development of science in the West, and the place that it quite rightly won for itself in the teaching of the young, had a side-effect that was not desirable. The advance of science during the last forty years of the nineteenth century was distinctly anti-Christian, and many of the crude and barbarous ideas taken over by Christianity from the earlier Scriptures of the Hebrews aroused not only disagreement but biting contempt. The leading scientists of the day were agnostics. Their books, eagerly read by the educated people of the time, gave rise to widespread scepticism, and the odious Blasphemy laws of England, revived against the popular Free-thought party, while avoiding the more dilettante unbeliever, made the former militant and aggressive. The one thing necessary to ensure Freedom seemed to be to make life "secular"; man must live without religion; this world was sufficient for itself. Morality should be based on Utilitarianism; religion was superfluous. It belonged to a pre-scientific age; it worked as a kind of addition to the police force; it weakened moral fibre and used up strength needed elsewhere. In order to secularise life, secular education was necessary; and "Education, free, compulsory and secular," became the war-cry of the Radicals.

The strong religious feeling of the masses of the British people, however, and their equally strong

[1] Reprinted from *The Commonweal*, April 30th, 1915.

common sense, persisted in demanding free and compulsory education, and dropped the third term, secular. It was seen that the training of character was as necessary for the discharge of civic duty as was the training of the intelligence, and it was realised that some foundation must be found on which the sense of duty might rest. This foundation could only be found in religion. Moreover, the more thoughtful people realised that both superstition and scepticism bore evil fruit in civil life; superstition was seen to result in mental and moral degradation, while scepticism conduced to moral indifference, narrowed and dwarfed human life, and sapped the emotional springs of happiness, by leading to the loss of faith in human nature. Religion was felt to be emotionally and morally necessary for man's healthy development, and was therefore an integral part of education. An analysis of human nature showed that its spiritual aspect was as demonstrable as its intellectual and emotional aspects, and to ignore it led to the most disastrous results. Unless the energies of the Spirit were guided into right channels, they were apt to burst up irregularly and to cause disturbance, even devastation: they broke out as superstition and fanaticism when denied legitimate expression, caused riot and bloodshed and widespread disturbance; it was seen to be necessary to recognise this apparently ineradicable aspect of human nature, unless States were prepared to be subject to perpetual turmoil. The cry for secular education ceased to be heard, and religious instruction remained an integral part of education.

In the East—as everywhere and always, save in the later Christendom—religion and education were inextricably intertwined. Since in all the ancient religions, the "Mysteries" were the special homes of

learning, and a rigid intellectual and moral training—"mathematics and music"—was required to precede candidature for admission, it was impossible to separate truth into two opposing halves. The division into the higher and lower learning indicated the difference between Realisation, which had to be achieved, and Knowledge, which could be imparted; all subjects which could be taught were massed together in the "lower," and there was no distinction between the "secular" and the "sacred". Educated Indians have introduced this distinction from the West, and it is profoundly mistaken. The knowledge of religion is no more sacred than the knowledge of logic, nor is mathematics more secular than philosophy. The truths of science are as religious as the truths of religion are scientific. The tearing in twain of truth makes each half lop-sided, and mars the dignity and consistency of human life.

Human consciousness is a Unit, and the Life expresses itself in Will, Wisdom and Activity, the three not being separate consciousnesses but modes of a single consciousness. In training the physical body to be a vehicle for the manifestation of these modes, the facts that all are modes of the one Self should never be forgotten. The mind, the emotions, the determining or selective force, all work through the body and must be reached through it. The mind is trained by intellectual instruction, the emotions by moral instruction, the determining energy by religious instruction. If the mind be left untrained, the man will be but as an animal; if the emotions be left untrained, he will be the sport of passion, unhappy and spreading unhappiness; if the determining energy be untrained, he will be drawn hither and thither by passing attractions and repulsions, and his actions will be governed by

circumstances, instead of being determined from within.

It may be said: "If all is religious, why teach religion as a separate subject?" A man might as well say: "If all teaching is scientific—as it should be—why teach science?" All branches of human knowledge should be taught, although all knowledge is sacred, and all sciences should form subjects of instruction, although all teaching should be scientific in method. The truths of religion need to be taught as much as the truths of science, but the schoolboy is taught only the accepted dogmas in all; the college student enters on realms where there is more discussion; in the outer world the man chooses his own views, according to the knowledge which he has been able to assimilate.

EDUCATION OF THE DEPRESSED CLASSES[1]

In every nation we find, as the basis of the social pyramid, a large class of people, ignorant, degraded, unclean in language and habits, people who perform many tasks which are necessary for society, but who are despised and neglected by the very society to whose needs they minister. In England this class is called the "submerged tenth," forming, as it does, one-tenth of the total population. It is ever on the verge of starvation, and the least extra pressure sends it over the edge. It suffers chronically from under-nutrition, and is a prey to the diseases which spring therefrom. It is prolific, like all creatures in whom the nervous system is of a low type, but its children die off rapidly, ill-nourished, rickety, often malformed. Its better type consists of unskilled labourers, who perform the roughest work, scavengers, sweepers, navvies, casual dock-labourers, costermongers; and into it, forming its worse type, drift all the wastrels of society, the drunkards, the loafers, the coarsely dissolute, the tramps, the vagabonds, the clumsily criminal, the ruffians. The first type is, as a rule, honest and industrious; the second ought to be under continued control, and forced to labour sufficiently to earn its bread. In India this class forms one-sixth of the total population, and goes by the generic name of the "depressed classes". It

[1] **Reprinted from a T.S. Order of Service Pamphlet issued in 1909.**

springs from the aboriginal inhabitants of the country, conquered and enslaved by the Aryan invaders, but has a civilisation behind it, in this differing from its English congener. It is composed of people whose ancestors lived a fairly cultivated life, and has been recruited by the illegitimate offspring of the conquering Aryans, so it is now a hybrid race with many intermixed varieties. It is drunken and utterly indifferent to cleanliness, whether of food, person or dwelling; but marriage is accompanied with some slight formality, children, are kindly treated, and there is very little brutality, violence, or criminality. Criminal communities, such as hereditary thieves, live apart, and do not mingle with the scavengers, sweepers, husbandmen and the followers of other simple crafts who make up the huge bulk of the depressed. They are gentle, docile, as a rule industrious, pathetically submissive, merry enough when not in actual want, with a bright though generally very limited intelligence; of truth and the civic virtues they are for the most part utterly devoid—how should they be anything else?—but they are affectionate, grateful for the slightest kindness, and with much "natural religion". In fact, they offer good material for simple and useful though humble civic life, very much better material than is found in the lowest strata of western lands. But they have been shamefully treated by their conquerors, who have shown to them the uttermost contempt and scorn. Even now, they scurry off the road if a Hindu of a superior class comes along; if the latter is forced to speak to one, he speaks from a distance; if he has to pay him for anything, he throws the money on the ground, and the other must pick it up; even if, against all his surroundings, a man of this class is sober, clean, and decent-living, he remains "untouchable" and despised. Nothing that he can do makes him

anything but a social pariah, a social outcaste; his only social salvation lies in his becoming a Christian or a Muhammadan, but, for the most part, these people cling, with pathetic affection, to the Hinduism which flouts and outrages them

What can be done for them by those who feel the barbarity of the treatment meted out to them, by those who feel that the Indians who demand freedom should show respect to others, and give to others a share of the consideration they claim for themselves?

Here, as everywhere, education is the lever by which we may hope to raise them, but a difficulty arises at the outset, for one class of the community, moved by a noble feeling of compassion and benevolence, but not adding thereto a careful and detailed consideration of the conditions, demands for the children of the pariah community admission to the schools frequented by the sons of the higher classes, and charges with lack of brotherhood those who are not in favour of this policy. It becomes, therefore, necessary to ask whether brotherhood is to mean levelling down, and whether it is usual in a family to treat the elder children and the babies in exactly the same way. It is a zeal not according to knowledge—and not according to nature—which would substitute equality for brotherhood, and demand from the cultured and refined that they should forfeit the hardly won fruits of the education of generations, in order to create an artificial equality, as disastrous to the progress of the future as it would be useless for the improvement of the present. The children of the depressed classes need, first of all, to be taught cleanliness, outside decency of behaviour, and the earliest rudiments of education, religion and morality. Their bodies, at present, are ill-odorous and foul, with the liquor and strong

smelling foods out of which for generations they have been built up; it will need some generations of purer food and living to make their bodies fit to sit in the close neighbourhood of a schoolroom with children who have received bodies from an ancestry trained in habits of exquisite personal cleanliness, and fed on pure food-stuffs. We have to raise the depressed classes to a similar level of physical purity, not to drag down the clean to the level of the dirty, and until this is done close association is undesirable. We are not blaming these children, nor their parents, for being what they are; we are stating a mere palpable fact. The first daily lesson in a school for these children should be a bath, and the putting on of a clean cloth, and the second should be a meal of clean wholesome food; those primary needs cannot be supplied in a school intended for children who take their daily bath in the early morning, and who come to school well fed.

Another difficulty that faces teachers of these children is the contagious diseases that are bred from dirt; to take one example, eye-disease, wholly due to neglect, is one of the most common and "catching" complaints among them. In our Panchama schools in Madras the teachers are ever on the alert to detect and check this, and the children's eyes are daily washed and the disease is thus prevented. But is it to be expected that fathers and mothers, whose daily care protects their children from such dirty diseases, should deliberately expose them at school to this infection?

Nor are the manners and habits of these forlorn little ones desirable things to be imitated by gently-nurtured children. Good manners, for instance, are the result of continual and rigid self-control, and of consideration for the comfort and convenience of

others; children learn manners chiefly by imitation from well-bred parents and teachers, and secondarily by suitable precept and reproof. If, at the school, they are to be made to associate with children not thus trained, they will quickly fall into the ways which they see around them. For until good habits are rendered fixed by long practice, it is far easier to be slipshod than accurate, to be careless than careful. Ought the children of families in which good manners and courtesy are hereditary, to be robbed of their heritage, a robbery that enriches no one, but drags the whole nation down? Gentle speech, well-modulated voice, pleasant ways, these are the valuable results of long culture, and to let them be swamped out is no true brotherhood. Rather should we try to share them with our younger brothers by training them as we have ourselves been trained.

In England, it has never been regarded as desirable to educate boys or girls of all classes side by side, and such grotesque equalising of the unequal would be scouted. Eton and Harrow are admittedly the schools for the higher classes; Rugby and Winchester are also schools for gentlemen's sons, though somewhat less aristocratic. Then come a number of schools, frequented chiefly by sons of the provincial middle class. Then the Board Schools, where the sons of artisans and the general manual labour classes are taught; and below all these, for the waifs and strays, are the "ragged schools," the name of which indicates the type of their scholars, and the numerous charitable institutions. A man in England who proposed that ragged school children should be admitted to Eton and Harrow would not be argued with, but laughed at. Here, when a similar proposition is made in the name of brotherhood, people

seem ashamed to point out frankly its absurdity, and they do not realise that the proposal is merely a violent reaction against the cruel wrongs which have been inflicted on the depressed classes, the outcry of an awakened conscience, which has not yet had time to call right reason to guide its emotions. It is sometimes said that Government schools pay no attention to social differences; therein they show that they are essentially "foreign" in their spirit. They would not deal so with the sons of their own people, though they may be careless of the sons of Indians, and lump them all together, clean and dirty alike. It is very easy to see the difference of "tone" in the youths when only the sons of the cultured classes are admitted to a school, and it is to the interest of the Indians that they should send their sons where they are guarded from coarse influences as Englishmen guard their own sons in England.

It is scarcely likely that I urge this on my Indian brethren from indifference to the suffering: for thirty-four years I have worked for those who suffer; but, perhaps because I have so long been in close touch with them, I know that they are not at present fit to come into association with children of happier surroundings. As I used to say to my Socialist friends: "If you think that these people in the slums are your equals, why labour to change the evil conditions? I think the conditions largely make them the ignorant and brutal people they are, so I want to change them." I know now that the conditions do not make the people, but that it is the drunken and dirty people who cause the conditions, and that the wastrels [illegible] mentioned, born under good conditions, come into these because they are their natural home. None the less, the environment reacts on the organism, though it does not create it, and prolongs the existence of the worse

qualities and retards the growth of the good. We, who have outgrown these conditions, can help our youngsters to grow out of them more quickly than they can do if we leave them to their own unassisted efforts. And hence the duty and responsibility which lie upon us of improving both the surroundings and the characters of the depressed classes by every means in our power, shortening the period of their lives in this stage, and utilising our knowledge in their favour. By teaching their children the elements of right living, we draw out and cultivate the germinal powers of the soul; and by checking and repressing the faults which are manifest, by improving their food and their environment, we help to build better bodies suitable for the more unfolded souls. This is the help we both can give and ought to give to these our successors on the stage of the world, and small will be our claim to the help of the greater Ones, if we refuse our help to these little ones of the human race. How shall we dare to plead to the Lords of Compassion to stoop to us and help us to rise, unless we, in our turn, stoop to those below us, and seek to raise them up?

THE EDUCATION OF INDIAN GIRLS[1]

ONE of the first things done by Countess Wachtmeister and myself, when we came to India in 1893, was to concern ourselves with the question of the education of girls. But many thoughtful Indians begged us to wait until we had secured the confidence of the Hindu community, so that no suspicion could arise with regard to our objects. The unhappy perversion of an Indian lady had shaken the confidence of the Hindu public with respect to girls' education, and they feared Christian proselytising under the garb of interest in education. The advice seemed sound and we accepted it.

Ten years have passed since then, and we may truly say that the confidence of the Hindu public in the purity of our aims and the straightforwardness of our actions has been won. The appeals to me to take up the education of girls have been many and urgent, and unqualified approval of the scheme I have submitted in writing and speech has been expressed. It seems time, therefore, to give this scheme a wider publicity, and, if it be acceptable, as it seems to be, to a large number of Hindus, then to let it serve as the basis of a national movement for the education of girls. It is already being followed in a few small girls' schools, carried on by Lodges of the Theosophical Society, and may henceforth take fuller shape.

[1] A pamphlet published in 1904.

The national movement for girls' education must be on national lines; it must accept the general Hindu conceptions of woman's place in the national life, not the dwarfed modern view but the ancient ideal. It must see in the woman the mother and the wife, or, as in some cases, the learned and pious ascetic, the Brahmavadini of older days. It cannot see in her the rival and competitor of man in all forms of outside and public employment, as woman, under different economic conditions, is coming to be, more and more, in the West. The West must work out in its own way the artificial problem which has been created there as to the relation of the sexes. The East has not to face that problem, and the lines of Western female education are not suitable for the education of Eastern girls. There may be exceptional cases, and when parents wish their daughters to follow the same course of education as their sons, they can readily secure for them that which they desire. But the *national* movement for the education of girls must be one which meets the national needs, and India needs nobly trained wives and mothers, wise and tender rulers of the household, educated teachers of the young, helpful counsellors of their husbands, skilled nurses of the sick, rather than girl-graduates, educated for the learned professions.

Let us, then, put down in order the essentials ot the education which is desirable for Indian girls.

I. *Religious and moral education.*—Every girl must be taught the fundamental doctrines of her religion, in a clear, simple and rational method. The Sanatana Dharma Series I and II, in the Vernaculars, will suit Hindu girls as well as Hindu boys, and girls thoroughly grounded in these will be able to study the *Advanced Text-Book* after leaving school, as they are not likely to remain there to an age fit for such study. The

Mahabharata and the *Ramayana*, in the Vernaculars, should be largely drawn on for moral instruction, as well as *Manusmriti*, and Tulsi Das' *Ramayana* should be read by all Hindi-knowing girls. To this should be added the teaching of hymns in the Vernacular and stotras in Sanskrit, as well as the committal to memory of many beautiful passages from the *Bhagavad Gita*, the *Hamsa Gita*, the *Anugita*, and other suitable works. They should be taught to worship, and simple plain explanations of the worship followed should be given, and, while the devotion so natural to an Indian woman should be nurtured, an intelligent understanding should be added to it, and a pure and enlightened faith, their natural heritage, should be encouraged in them. Where any girl shows capacity for deeper thought, philosophical studies and explanations should not be withheld from her, so that opportunity may be afforded for the re-appearance of the type of which Maitreyi and Gargi and the women singers of the Vedas were shining examples. Girls belonging to the Islamic and Zoroastrian faiths should be similarly instructed, the books of their respective religions taking the place of the Hindu works named above. There is an abundant wealth of beautiful devotional verse in Persian, to culture and elevate the mind of the Muslim girl, to whom also should be opened the stores of Arabic learning. The Zoroastrian has also ample sacred treasures for the instruction of his girls, and can utilise selections from the Avesta, Pahlavi and Persian. I do not know if there is much available vernacular literature in these faiths in Southern India, but in Northern India Urdu literature for the girls of Islam is not lacking.

II. *Literary Education.*—A sound literary knowledge of the Vernacular should be given, both in

reading and writing. Vernacular literature, in Hindi, Urdu, Bengali, Marathi, Gujerati, Telugu and Tamil, is sufficiently rich in original works and translations to give full scope for study, and to offer a store of enjoyment for the leisure hours of later life. A colloquial knowledge of some Vernacular other than her own would be useful to a girl, if time would allow of the learning. A classical language, Sanskrit or Arabic or Persian, according to the girl's religion, should be learned sufficiently to read with pleasure the noble literature contained therein, and the quick Indian girl will readily master sufficient of one of these tongues to prove a never-failing delight to her in her womanhood, and to listen with intelligent pleasure to the reading of her husband as he enjoys the masterpieces of the great writers. Indian history and Indian geography should be thoroughly taught, and reading-books should be provided consisting of stories of all the sweetest and strongest women in Indian story, so that the girls may feel inspired by these noblest types of womanhood as compelling ideals. and may have before them these glorious proofs of the heights to which Indian women have climbed. The very narrowness of their present lives, their triviality and frivolity, render the more necessary the presentation to them of a broad and splendid type as a model for their uplifting, and while their minds will be thus widened and their ideas enlarged, at the same time they will be led along lines purely national and in consonance with immemorial ideals. If the Westernising, in a bad sense, of Indian men be undesirable, still more undesirable is such Westernising of Indian women; the world cannot afford to lose the pure, lofty, tender, and yet strong, type of Indian womanhood. It is desirable, also, seeing how much English thought is dominating the minds of the men, and how many sympathetic Englishwomen seek to

know their Indian sisters, that the girls should learn English, and have thus opened to them the world of thought outside India; in later life they may make many a pleasant excursion into that world in the company of their husbands, and the larger horizons will interest without injuring.

III. *Scientific Education.*—Nothing is more necessary to the Indian wife and mother, ruler often of a household that is a little village, than a knowledge of sanitary laws, of the value of food-stuffs, of nursing the sick, of simple medicines, of "first aid" in accidents, of cookery of the more delicate kind, of household management, and the keeping of accounts. The hygiene of the household should be thoroughly taught, the value of fresh air, sunlight and scrupulous cleanliness; these were, indeed, thoroughly understood and practised by the elder generation, and must still, if learned in the school-room, find their field of practice in the home; but the latest generation seems to be in all this far behind its grandmothers. Essential again is a knowledge of the value of food-stuffs, and of their effects on the body in the building of muscular, nervous and fatty tissues, of their stimulative or nutrient qualities. Some knowledge of simple medicines is needed by every mother, that she may not be incessantly calling in a doctor; she should also be able to deal with accidental injuries, completely with slight ones, and sufficiently with serious ones to prevent loss of life while awaiting the surgeon's coming; simple nursing every girl should learn, and the importance of accuracy in observing directions, keeping fixed hours for food and medicine, etc. Sufficient arithmetic should be learned for all household purposes, for quick and accurate calculation of quantities and prices, and the keeping of accounts. A knowledge of cookery has always

been part of the education of the Indian housewife, and this should still have its place in education, or there will be little comfort in the house for husband and children. The Indian cook—like cooks in other countries—does his work all the better if the house-mother is able to supervise and correct.

IV. *Artistic Education.*—Instruction in some art should form part of the education for a girl, so that leisure in later life may be pleasantly and adequately filled, instead of being wasted in gossip and frivolity. South India is leading the way in musical education, and the prejudice against it is disappearing. The singing of stotras, to an accompaniment on the *vina*, or other instrument, is a refining and delightful art in which the girls take the greatest pleasure, and one which enables them to add greatly to the charm of home. Drawing and painting are arts in which some find delight, and their deft fingers readily learn exquisite artistic embroidery and needlework of all kinds. Needless to say that all should learn sewing, darning and the cutting-out of such made garments as are used in their districts. In all of these, the natural taste of the pupil should be the guide to the selection of the art, though almost all, probably, will take part in singing.

V. *Physical Education.*—The training and strengthening of the bodies of the future mothers must not be left out of sight, and, to this end, physical exercises of a suitable kind should form part of the school curriculum. In Southern India, the girls are very fond of exercises in which they move to the sound of their own songs, performing often complicated exercises, in some of which patterns are woven and unwoven in coloured threads attached to a centre high overhead, the ends of the threads being held by the girls, whose evolutions make and unmake the

pattern. Other exercises somewhat resemble the well known "Swedish exercises," and all these are good; and there re games which give exercise of a pleasant and active kind. These conduce to the health of young bodies, and give grace of movement, removing all awkwardness. Nothing is prettier than to see a group of girls moving gracefully to the sound of their own young voices, in and out, in mazy evolutions, with clapping of soft palms or clash of light playing-sticks The lack of physical exercise leads to many chronic ailments in womanhood and to premature old age.

Such is an outline of the education which would, it seems to me, prove adequate to the needs of the young daughters of India, and would train them up into useful and cultured women, heads of happy households, "lights of the home".

There will always be some exceptional girls, who need for the due evolution of their faculties a more profound and a wider education, and these must be helped to what they need as individuals, each on her own line. Such girls may be born into India in order to restore to her the learned women of the past, and to place again in her diadem the long lost pearl of lofty female intelligence. It is not for any to thwart them in their upward climbing, or to place unnecessary obstacles in their path.

Of this we may be sure, that Indian greatness will not return until Indian womanhood obtains a larger, a freer, and a fuller life, for largely in the hands of Indian women must lie the redemption of India. The wife inspires or retards the husband; the mother makes or mars the child. The power of woman to uplift or debase man is practically unlimited. and man and woman must walk forward hand-in-hand to

the raising of India, else will she never be raised at all. The battle for the religious and moral education of boys is won, although the victory has still to be made effective all over India. The battle for the education of girls is just beginning, and may Ishvara bless those who are the vanguard, and all beneficent Powers enlighten their minds and make strong their hearts!

GIRLS' EDUCATION[1]

There is no question of more vital importance to any Nation than that of the education of its women, and the effect of higher education in Great Britain, to take but one example, is to increase enormously her power to defend her existence as a Nation, by having a second line of defence in her women. They have sprung forward to set the men free for the fighting line, serving not only as doctors in the field in a way which has astonished their men colleagues, but supplying the gaps left in the profession at home by the exodus of the men. Educated women have not only taken up the posts left vacant by men in offices and places of business, but they have volunteered as police constables, as motor-drivers, as signallers, etc., in order to enable the work of the country to be carried on without interruption. Moreover, they have organised relief associations, work societies, associations for the reception and distribution of refugees, with rare ability and thoroughness, and with that capacity for administration which is so remarkably a feminine characteristic.

The effect of education, accompanied, as it has been, by outdoor games and exercises, has been to develop vigour, initiative, and all-round power of "taking hold," and the remarkable success of the suffrage societies has proved the educative value of the struggle through which they have passed. The

[1] Reprinted from *The Commonweal*, April 16th, 1915.

contrast between the women of Britain to-day and those of the early Victorian period, the helpless, fainting, dependent beings, dear to the heart of Thackeray—the Amelias of the time—is astonishing. The women of to-day are the splendid types of earlier British women of Lancastrian, York, Tudor and Stuart days, the type found here in India among the heroic women of *Mahabharata* days, or of Rajputana and Maharashtra in later times.

Here in India, a great wave of change is passing over Indian Womanhood, and any who visit various parts of the country on behalf of public movements must have noticed the new aspirations stirring in the hearts of Indian women at the present time. Large gatherings of them assemble to listen to women speakers, and some of the speeches delivered by women during the South African agitation, and lately on the Post-Puberty Marriage Bill, were admirable alike in form and in substance. The change is partly due to English influences reacting upon them through their husbands; partly to direct contact with Englishwomen—this more in Madras City, than anywhere else in India. But it must not be forgotten that the obscuration of Indian women, so far as interest in public life is concerned, is a very modern phenomenon, the last of the really great women Rulers having died only early in the 19th century. The education of the women of Maharashtra has never disappeared, and women's clubs for study, for cultivation of the arts, for lectures and readings, are found scattered over the country. At Nagpur, at Masulipatam, at Conjiveram, at Bangalore —to take but four instances—such associations for mutual culture are found. Culture in the north and in Bengal, where the purda system prevails, has been gained largely by the reading of religious literature in

Sanskrit and in the vernaculars by family Gurus, by the performance of Hari-kirtanams and the like. Those who judge of the educational status of Indian women by the census test of literacy go very far astray in their opinions.

English influence is now playing upon Indian Womanhood educationally and socially, and along social lines it is by no means wholly desirable. Where Indian ladies and girls are suddenly plunged into the very mixed Anglo-Indian society of large towns, without the possibility of the previous experience which would enable them to distinguish between the cultured and the ill-bred, between the restrained courtesy of the well-born Englishwoman and the noisy and familiar manners of the parvenu, they have presented to them a mixture of desirable and undesirable ways, all "English" and therefore, presumably, to be imitated. The effect is not always beautiful. The innate good taste and dignity of the Indian woman would guide her safely, if she would act on her own judgment and follow her own instincts, but these are sometimes overborne by ill-advised counsel. Moreover, the desire to imitate leads to mixtures of costumes which are neither graceful nor becoming, and have only the one English quality of being expensive. For all these eccentricities education is the corrective, and the education of the past being gone beyond recall, a wisely devised new form of education must replace it.

And here we must repeat our often reiterated declaration that the education of Indian girls must be shaped, guided and controlled by Indians, else will the heart of the Nation be corrupted and the Motherland, which has survived all wounds to her men, will perish by the despiritualisation and the denationalisation of her women. The religion of Indian women

is often not according to knowledge; perfect in her devotion, she is lacking in philosophical insight; of swift intelligence and quick intuition, she grasps with ease a great truth when it is presented to her, and sees its application to life; but she is often taught but forms and ceremonies, which she uses as channels for her devotion without rationalising them by her understanding. "Add to your faith, knowledge," is a precept needed in the home. Whatever else woman's education may comprise, Hinduism, spiritual and lofty, must be its foundation and its coping-stone; when Hinduism has no longer its temple in the heart of the Hindu woman, the Motherland will be ready for the burning-ghat.

The ethics taught in the education of girls must include patriotism, the realisation of duty to the Motherland, of readiness to sacrifice for her weal. Indian history is full of the shining examples of such love and such sacrifice, and the stories of these daughters of the Motherland will give what is needed.

Apart from every other reason, the necessity for religious and moral education is sufficient basis for the statement that the education of Indian girls must be under Indian control. Will Missionaries teach Hinduism, or Islam, or foreigners supreme love of country? Indian history, Indian scriptures, Indian dramas, Indian arts—these must dominate the education of Indian girls.

For any education beyond the most elementary, it is obvious that pre-puberty marriage must be abolished. Children married at 7 and 8, at 9 and 10, at 11 and 12, how can they be educated? Made mothers at 13 and 14, children bearing children, of what avail to mention education in the same breath as these? The indecency, the outrage of such

marriages are invisible to men and women blinded by evil custom, hypnotised by habit. These helpless victims, sold into slavery by their own fathers to purchased husbands, is it possible that India shall become free so long as this child-slavery remains, and a Hindu girl is, as a Hindu lately said, without apparently any sense of shame, a chattel? Chattel-slavery still existing in a land which we are striving to free!

Literature, art in some form—music, drama, painting—science, chiefly as bearing on the hygiene and the food supply of the home, domestic medicine, first aid—all these should find their place in primary and secondary education; physical education must not be omitted, to develop and strengthen the body. For those who desire higher education, the curriculum will necessarily be much the same as for boys, but these, as everywhere, will be a small minority.

Wherever possible, the education of girls should be in home classes or in day-schools; boarding-schools have many disadvantages. If the latter are necessary, as they may be in some cases, then they should, as much as possible, have the home atmosphere, and it is absolutely necessary that the whole domestic control of a boarding house for Hindu girls should be in the hands of a well-bred Hindu lady, of mature age, who can create and preserve that home atmosphere, and shall play the part of a careful and loving mother to the girls.

Only along some such lines as these, laid down by the counsel of Indian men and women, can the present burgeoning life of Indian girlhood grow into noble womanhood. What Indian women have been, we know; what they are to-day, despite all disadvantages, we see—and earth has no fairer flowers; what they

shall be, who can say? We hope for, we dream of, a Womanhood that shall blend into one perfect whole the wisdom of Gargi, the tameless courage and wit of Savitri, the unchanging love of Sita, the proud endurance of Damayanti, the unwavering fealty of Shakuntala.

THE DANGER OF EDUCATION[1]

SAID Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, in his valuable book, *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*, published in 1901:

> The introduction of English education, with its great, noble, elevating and civilising literature and advanced science, will forever remain a monument of good work done in India and a claim to gratitude upon the Indian people. The education has taught the highest political ideal of British citizenship and raised in the hearts of educated Indians the hope and aspiration to be able to raise their countrymen to the same ideal citizenship. This hope and aspiration as their greatest good are at the bottom of all their present sincere and earnest loyalty, in spite of the disappointments, discouragements and despotism of a century and a half. (P. VI.)

Let us consider the aim and object of English education in England, the education which Mr. Macaulay proceeded to introduce into India in the year of grace 1835, just eighty years ago this very year. The English boy is taught at his mother's knee that a boy must be brave, and truthful, and honourable, because he belongs to a free Nation. When he goes to school, he may neglect his books, may be proud, quarrelsome, or imperious, but he must "play the game" with his fellows, not be a sneak or a coward. He learns, not with much interest at first, the Greek ideas of a free State, Roman ideas of a

[1] Reprinted from *The Commonweal*, July 2nd, 1915

Republic, and he recites pieces of Greek and Latin at his school anniversaries, till the idea of freedom unconsciously becomes as a law of Nature for a Man. As he grows older he reads of Arthur and Alfred, of Harold and William, of King Henry II's struggle for freedom against Rome, and of the struggle for freedom of the barons against King John, and of the struggle for freedom of the cities against the barons. And he notes the first calling of a Parliament by Edward I, "as it is a most equitable rule that what concerns all should be approved by all, and common dangers be repelled by united efforts". And he reads of many wars, and of Kings pulled down and others set up, and then further on of the refusal of ship-money, and the execution of a King for treason, and of Pym and Hampden, of Cromwell and his Ironsides, and of another King driven into exile, and of a Dutchman chosen as King of England, and then of a German King because Britain could not stomach another Stuart; and how the second German King, not knowing English, left his Council to manage its own business to its great advantage; and then of the War of Independence in America, because Britain wanted to tax her Colony without its own consent, and how a Republic was born which is now mighty; and he reads Burke on the French Revolution, and Milton's *Aeropagitica*, and the long struggle of the Quakers for liberty of conscience, and so on and on, to the fight of John Wilkes and to that of Charles Bradlaugh against the House of Commons, embodiment of Britain's freedom grown tyrannical, and the bowing of that mightiest power of all, which had played with Kings, before the will of the people and their free choice of members; and he hears talk of Mazzini and Garibaldi, and how London welcomed the scarlet-shirted rebel; and he grows to know and to feel in his innermost heart that he, the boy, as a son of

England, must love her, serve her, live for her, die for her, but at all risks keep her free. He is bidden to honour her as champion of liberty, to salute her flag, " under which no slave can live," and his heart responds to Liberty's music and he holds his head high and looks all men in the face; and he cheers the great men of his own day, and vows to stand where they are standing; and he knows that he has the right to win power and to hold it, to rise to be Prime Minister, Lord Chancellor, Field-Marshall, Admiral—there is nothing he may not be if his heart be strong enough and his brain keen enough; for is he not a citizen of no mean country, and who shall bid the freeborn Englishman to bow down before aught but that which he wills to reverence? Who shall gag his mouth, break his pen, bid him be silent when he wills to speak? Rejoicing in his strength, rejoicing in his freedom, the young Englishman goes out into the world, his soul afire, his ambition awake, his own strength the limit of his achievement. He is what English education makes him; and in his own country he is a noble breed.

And Mr. Macaulay brings this English education to India in 1833, to a country under the yoke of another Nation, with every office of importance closed to the children of the land, with no openings for honourable ambition, with no great prizes to strive for—all the sweet rosy apples within a high fence of barbed wire, called a Colour Bar, and a few crab apples assigned to set on edge the teeth of the native. With charming indifference to consequence he piled up his gunpowder, struck a match, lighted the fuse. Great Heavens! he might as well have given babies a piece of dynamite to cut their teeth on.

He was not all unconscious of the possibilities, for —speaking in 1833 on the clause in the Company's

Charter Bill which laid down the preposterous principle that no Native of India should, by his religion, place of birth, descent, or colour, be disabled from holding any place or office, a promise repeated in 1858 by H. M. the Queen but always treated whether by Company or Government as a mere scrap of paper—he asked :

Are we to keep the people of India ignorant in order that we may keep them submissive? or do we think that we can give them knowledge without awaking ambition, or do we mean to awaken ambition, and to provide it with no legitimate vent? . . . It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown the system ; that by good Government, we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better Government, that, having become instructed in European knowledge, they may, in some future age, demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not. But never will I attempt to avert or to retard it. Whenever it comes, it will be the proudest day in English history.

The day is here. But Macaulay is dead.

The fuse burned steadily on. The Arya Samaja arose. The Theosophical Society came. Six years later the National Congress was born. A whisper, "Self-Government," gruesome word, ran round the country. There were Councils of sorts. The barbed wire fence was a little contracted —not much. All the rich red apples were still inside. But education, English education, was doing its dangerous work. Men talked about Liberty. Strange words of Rights, of Citizenship—nay, worse, of Wrongs—were heard. There was an American War—a War to free slaves—a Nation, enjoying Freedom, drawing the sword upon itself, pouring out its blood for the Freedom of the alien, the African. And Negroes were given votes.

There was a minority, English-educated, that had drunk the strong wine of English literature, and rejoiced in the drinking. A whisper, a murmur, a cry: "We would be free." And there were several famines.

Now indeed the danger of education was seen. Without it, they would have bowed to an inscrutable will. With it, they wanted to know why India, once so rich, was now so poor. How much poorer was she to become? Knowledge had been given; ambition was awakened? Where was the legitimate vent? "We are made B.A.'s, and M.D.'s, etc., with the strange result that we are not yet considered fit to teach our countrymen. We must yet have forced upon us, even in this department, as in every other, every European that can be squeezed in," growled Dadabhai Naoroji, an English-educated Indian; education had made him discontented; what a mistake to tack all those letters of the alphabet on to Indian names! And he recalled so many unpleasant remarks of older men in India, of men who were not bureaucrats but statesmen, who saw England's duty as the freeing of India not in keeping her enslaved. They gave English education, knowing what they did, and willing the results. Madmen, were they? He quoted Sir John Malcolm saying that "if we do not use the knowledge we impart it will be employed against us . . . If these plans are not associated with the creation of duties that will employ the minds which we enlighten, we shall only prepare elements that will hasten the destruction of our Empire." The Duke of Devonshire actually said: "It is not wise to educate the people of India, to introduce among them your civilisation and your progress and your literature, and at the same time to tell them that they shall never have any chance of taking any part or share in the

administration of the affairs of their country, except by getting rid in the first instance of their European rulers."

Anglo-India approves: "It is not wise. Let's have a commission and stop it." Mr. Naoroji had actually had the insolence to write in 1880 to the India Office—our particular clearing-house—not to make allusions to drains:

> The thousands that are being sent out by the universities every year find themselves in a most anomalous position. There is no place for them in their Motherland . . . They may perish or do what they like or can, but scores of Europeans must go from this country to take up what belongs to them, and that in spite of every profession, for years and years past and up to the present day, of English statesmen, that they must govern India for India's good . . . The educated find themselves simply so many dummies, ornamented with the tinsel of school education, and with them their whole end and aim of life is ended. What must be the inevitable consequence?

Stop the consequence by stopping the cause—Education.

The Japanese War heartened up the East; it was a pleasant change. Unrest grew. There was the English way and the Anglo-Indian way. Reform or Gag. A mixture was offered: much Gag and little Reform; the minority of the educated was microscopic, thank God. Education was in fault; the dear ignorant masses they were not discontented, or if so, they could not say so. It was these articulate people who were such a nuisance. Education was at the root of all the mischief. Raise the fees—the cleverest people are poor. Give the boys goody-goody tales to read—English literature is so dangerous. Pluck University candidates wholesale. Do away

with Matriculation and have a certificate which is neither a pass nor a failure. Then who can grumble? Demand efficiency in brass and furniture, so as to crush out the poorer colleges. The fuse is shortening, the burning-end is getting too near the gunpowder. Stamp it out! Stop all this revolutionary teaching of English history, and take care what you teach an Indian. Select your poetry carefully: Mrs. Hemans, now, is a nice safe writer; perhaps Longfellow; but no, he wrote about the Pilgrim Fathers—very dangerous. Have selections: "The Psalm of Life" is safe; selections are best, for really no English poet is safe all through. "The Curfew tolls" will do, and "We are seven". Some of Browning's obscurer pieces will give a decent literary touch, but for goodness sake keep out:

> Just for a handful of silver he left us,
> Just for a ribbon to stick in his coat.

Rude people might apply it to some highly respectable Dewan Bahadurs, of whom there had been hopes, wisely extinguished by a neck-ribbon and medal.

There! there's plenty of rubbish in the English language to make English study repulsive and the English will then give us many failed Matriculates—it will be so deadly dull.

What do you say? 2800 plucked Intermediate? I said Education was dangerous, and see how unhappy it has made all these lads. If they had had no English education, they would not have been plucked. Why make troubles, and then cry over them?

YOUNG MEN'S ASSOCIATIONS [1]

WHAT is the value of a Young Men's Association, and what are the objects at which such a body should aim? In all parts of the world these organisations are found, and both value and objects must be largely determined by local needs and local conditions. In countries in which the life of the student is carefully looked after, where his needs as to board and lodging are well supplied, where games are plentiful and well equipped, where libraries are available and where, in fact, all that a lad or young man can reasonably require is placed within his reach, such associations are not needed for public school boys and University men. They are generally therefore found in connection with the less wealthy classes and give to these the amenities and enjoyments which are provided as a matter of course for the fortunate. No Harrow or Eton boy, no Oxford or Cambridge man is left uncared for and ill-supplied during the years of education.

But in India things are different. Lads crowd into large towns to attend High Schools and Colleges; they live where they can, they eat as they can. Crowded in backyards, sometimes in the upper stories of houses of ill-fame, thousands of them live neglected, without any of the nobler influences of home, without opportunities of relaxation and amusement save at the peril of health and morals; too often they

[1] Reprinted from *The Commonweal*, February 20th, 1914.

are led astray by those who need them as tools; their readiness to sacrifice themselves, their eager enthusiasms are played upon, and their noblest feelings are distorted and degraded. For such lads a Young Men's Association means a helper, a friend, a saviour. It brings them into touch with elder men of high ideals and of pure life, who are still young enough to sympathise, yet old enough to advise; it places before them good examples of patriotism, of service of the Motherland, of daily self-sacrifice, and stirs them to emulation while insensibly leading them away from evil. It gives them friends who are worthy of confidence, leaders who inspire to enthusiasm, and thus disciplines emotion without chilling it, and trains it to serve not only to shout. Self-control, courtesy, helpfulness, flourish in such an atmosphere, and unconsciously youthful ambitions are purified and youthful hopes flower into deeds. It is impossible to over-estimate the value of the association with the coming generation of true, brave, and unselfish elders. These youths who will be the citizens of to-morrow and hold the destiny of India in their hands—these are here, ready, eager, to set their feet on the path of Service. God grant that all who have set their hands to this great work may so inspire them by high example that Madras, and gradually all India, may rise to a noble ideal of patriotism and of public life.

Another side of these Associations is that they offer recreation of an attractive kind in pure surroundings. A gymnasium should always be established as soon as possible, and fitted up with suitable apparatus. Some officer should be found to act as drill-master, and a trained Indian athlete to teach the indigenous exercises in addition to the Western methods; there is nothing so good as the former for developing every

muscle in the body and increasing chest capacity; for this breathing exercises must not be forgotten. At the Central Hindu College we had these exercises in addition to games, and the effect on the health and growth of the boys was striking.

There should be recreation-rooms for suitable games, as well as a reading room for ephemeral literature and a good library for study and quiet reading. Music should not be forgotten, while lectures and debates should also find their place.

There remains the question of housing for students, so pressing in Madras, but this must be considered in a future article.

These associations should by no means be confined to students. The young men who have left college or school, who are employed in Government or other offices and banks, clerks who are educated but poor—all these will find a home in such Associations. The field is wide; the harvest is ripe; many labourers have come forward. All patriotic and wide-minded men, who work for the future, should be ready to help in the Madras centre, if residents here, or to found and guide similar Associations all over India.

NATIONAL EDUCATION[1]

THE subject to-night I have called "National Education," because I want especially to lay before you the necessity for Indians as a people taking up the question of education in a far more active and consistent manner than they have hitherto done. I want to suggest to you certain lines of work, varying in their nature, but all directed to the same end. For the work of education in this country is far too difficult and vast for any Government to compass by itself, however willing it may be to do so. Not without national effort, not without national co-operation, is it possible for the education of India to rise to the position to which it ought to attain.

Now if for a moment you look westwards on education, you will find that it has gone along two especial lines. In France and in Germany education is predominantly the work of the Government, and voluntary education only steps in, as it were, to fill up any gaps which the Government may have left. I need not say anything on the French struggles of later years in which—as some of us think most unwisely—the Government has practically destroyed the voluntary system, and in its opposition to religion has closed the voluntary schools. In England things have gone rather on the opposite line. The chief efforts have been voluntary rather than governmental,

[1] A lecture delivered in Bombay, on April 17th, 1914.

and Government has only stepped in to fill up the gaps in the voluntary system. By great benefactions given in the past, such as those which made Winchester possible, those which founded the public school of Eton and that of Harrow, in all these you will find private benefactions, sometimes certainly royal, but given by the King as man rather than as ruler, and many of the greatest foundations there are foundations given by ordinary people, by great merchants, by famous conquerors or nobles, voluntarily given for the rearing of youth. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge are made up largely of colleges founded by private benevolence, and it is only comparatively lately that Government has largely taken up the question of education, partly because of the great economic necessities, owing to the absolute necessity of training the manufacturing and the artisan classes in order that they might compete successfully with the ever-increasing volume of foreign trade and commerce; and so also, as you know, they have founded colleges along scientific lines, so that applied science might be turned to purposes of production, and in this way England might be able to hold her own among the competing markets of the world.

When we look across from Europe to America, there we see a most extraordinary development. Nothing, I think, is more wonderful in the history of modern civilisation than the way in which the millionaires and multi-millionaires of America are pouring out their wealth into educational channels. University after University, college after college, these are being erected by men of enormous wealth, who are thus giving back to the country the wealth which, by economic organisation, has poured into their hands. You find a man like Rockefeller, for

instance, trying to create a huge education trust, pouring into that his almost uncounted millions, and this very fact that he is trying to form an educational trust speaks of the public spirit of the Americans of huge wealth, who realise that the future of the country depends upon education more than upon anything else. There you have the voluntary system taking a new departure, trying to cope with the special necessities of a vast and developing nationality.

Hence India has the advantage, if she chooses to take it, of studying all these different systems, avoiding the mistakes that have been made in the past and utilising to the full those new ideas on educational subjects, so full of instruction for us, thought out by men who are born educationists, experiments which now are being tried. It is worth while for those of you who find yourselves at one with the proposition that I submit, to see that India as a nation shall take up the question of education—it is worth while for you to read very carefully some of these later experiments in the West, and especially perhaps that system which goes under the name of its founder, the Montessori system. There you have a woman, highly educated herself—Dr. Montessori—who has struck out an entirely new line in the way of education, in which she accepts, what, I should submit, is a fundamentally Eastern idea: the idea that the child who comes into your hands is not a mere child to be coerced, but an intellectual and spiritual nature to be given full opportunity of development along its own natural lines of evolution, instead of having forced upon it the line of its elders, who are supposed to be naturally its superiors. It is beginning to be recognised in the West that it does not follow that the child is really the inferior of the older people. It is possible that the nature of the child,

the soul of the child, as we should say, is not less developed than the soul of the parents at any rate; it is likely to be—if not superior, because preparing to enter the coming civilisation—it is likely to be at least on an average level with those into whose family the body is born. It is seen more and more that it is the duty of the parents and the teacher to study the child, in order that they may help it along its own line of natural evolution, and not to endeavour to strive to force it into a line uncongenial to the child's own nature, to the instincts, the qualities, the faculties of the child. There was strife in England in the last century on the question whether the inborn character or the outer environment was the stronger factor in the building up of the character of the child. You may remember that Robert Owen, and others of that school, regarded environment as the one important point, and considered that anything could be made out of a child if only the environment were good; but as science has begun to speak more and more clearly on the evolutionary forces, it has come to be realised that the nature that the child brings into the world is more important as a factor in character than the training, the education, the environment of the child. You have it summed up in a well recognised scientific phrase now: "Nature is stronger than nurture." The organism reacts more strongly than the environment impresses, and while that is so—and that must not be overlooked—no more must we overlook the fact that environment has much to do with the making of character, that good surroundings, good thoughts, good feelings, on the part of the elders and the teachers and the companions of the growing child, these may either stimulate or almost atrophy the germs of the qualities brought by the child into the world. Just as with a plant you can prune it, develop it, giving it suitable manure, water, light,

sunshine, air, and so enable it to grow at its best, but you cannot alter the fundamental nature of the growing plant, so is it with the child. You may eliminate the worst side of the child by not supplying material on which the worst side will develop; you may gradually starve out any germinal vice, as you may stimulate any germinal virtue. But while that is true, the child that comes into your hands is not a page for you to write on what you will. It is a page written on by the pen of the past; and you can only modify, you cannot entirely rewrite.

Taking that as a fundamental principle, let us consider, as regards India, how far shall the nation take education into its own hands, and allow the Government to do that which apparently it would be glad to do: namely, let the control of education go more and more into the hands of the people. Is that a better course for India, or would it be wiser by largely increased taxation to throw education more and more into the hands of Government? Is that the better course for the building of the nation, or can the people at large do better by assuming more and more of the responsibility? Now I take it for granted that for many, many a year to come the two systems must run on side by side. Whatever effort the Indian people may make, they cannot shoulder the whole burden of education at once, or even within a brief time. There must remain a very large part of education guided and controlled by the Government. How far is it desirable gradually to bring the control into the hands of the people, and how far should the Educational Department be included under the growing control—a control that will grow more and more in the coming years—of all those who are elected as representatives of the people and who ought to voice their ideals and their aspirations?

I submit, first of all, that the most vital interests of the nation are admittedly bound up in the education of the young. At the present time education in India is in this very difficult position, that a large number of the most coveted lines of occupation can only be entered on with a view to climbing to higher posts after the education begun in India is finished by transplantation to England. You know how many appointments—the Indian Civil Service, the higher part of the medical profession, the higher educational service, in fact you may say all the higher posts in the national life—cannot be occupied by Indians who only follow education in their own country, and do not crown it by going to England to undergo a certain course laid down there. Now that is becoming increasingly difficult as far as the students are concerned. It is quite true, as Mr. Gokhale said not long ago, that India ought to be able to supply all that she herself needs in education, but while that is true theoretically, practically the door is shut in the face of every ambitious young Indian, who desires to serve his country in the higher posts. He must go to England in order to have the English seal impressed upon him, but, while that is necessary, his desire for gaining that education is encircled with greater and greater difficulties.

Now this is obviously partly a political question. You cannot separate the life of a nation into water-tight compartments, and divide off entirely political questions from those that have to do with education; for as long as there is only one road to certain posts of Government employment, as long as that implies travelling to a foreign country where alone the necessary education can be gained, so long as that is the case, it is inevitable that Indians shall ask either that you shall change this rule, and have simultaneous

examinations which will enable their own people to pass in a fair way, and open up the road to higher ranks of rule in their own country, or else that you shall facilitate, and not hinder, their going to England, and shall not make the life of the Indian students there impossible. If you take the Universities, the colleges are becoming more and more difficult to enter. Only two Indians may now be admitted each year into each college of Oxford and Cambridge. If this restrictive policy is to go on in England, it must be accompanied by a more liberal policy over here. They must alter the conditions under which young Indians are to be trained for work in their own country. It is not possible, as education spreads, it is not possible, under the impulse of English training given in our Universities and schools, it is not possible, as the late Viceroy, Lord Minto, said, that England should hold up an ideal to Indian youths, and imbue them with a love of English liberty and an admiration for English ways of rule, and then say : "You must not put into practice that which we have taught you in the school and in the college, and after having learnt to admire English ways, you must be shut out from the natural results of the very enthusiasm and the very inspiration which the touch of these in youth was intended to supply." Lord Minto said, and said rightly, and said openly, that for what England has done, England must bear the responsibility. She has stimulated Indian youths. She has held herself up as an example of what liberty can do for a nation, and it is the greatest compliment to her that India wants to imitate what England has done, and shows by her practical aspirations how she admires the lessons of liberty which in school and University she has learnt. It is too late to turn back the tide ; it is too late to shut the book. No withdrawal of English

history now from school and college will check the rising tide of India's national life. Now you may justly say, from the quotation I just made from Lord Minto, that the best in England desire that the lesson should bear fruit, and that is so. Hence Government must either choose to give Indian students in England a fair field, or else give us in this country open doors which will lead to the higher positions under the State.

But it seems to me that in order that this may be well done, it is the fathers and guardians of the Indian boys and girls who must take up this question of education and deal with it for themselves, and that is my answer to the question I propounded. No people can judge a nation's needs as well as the grown-up men and women of the nation themselves; no Government can know as well as they can what they want. Well, what you need in education is—you ought to know it, if you are thinking of the future of your country—that certain vital points in our school and college curricula should be altered in order to make the education the blessing that it ought to be, not an English education transplanted into India, but an Indian education embracing everything of the best that the Western nations have to give. Looking at this a little more in detail, you have to consider in education, first, the education wanted for the teaching and the administrative classes, the learned professions, and Government Service—what is called the literary education. Then you have to consider the education which is wanted for the carrying on effectively of the trade, of the commerce and the manufactures of the country, an education pre-eminently scientific and business-like, or to use one word, technical education. Then you have to consider the education of women, so much neglected

in modern days, but so vitally necessary for Indian progress. And lastly, mass education, the education for the great masses of the people, so that they may intelligently co-operate in all matters that concern the national welfare and that there may not be the gulf that there is to-day between the English-educated classes, and those vast inarticulate classes of the population, on whom in the long run the life and the prosperity of the nation must depend.

Four kinds of education, then, you have to think out carefully, outlining them with sufficient detail. Now with regard to the first of these, what I have called Literary Education, the one suggestion that I would press on you as necessary in the way of change is that Indian subjects shall be dominant in that education, and subjects connected with other countries shall take a secondary instead of a primary place. Think for a moment of philosophy. German philosophy is only Indian philosophy written in Western languages, it is your own philosophy with a new face put upon it by the modern German thinker. Fundamentally their philosophy is Eastern in its conception. When you look more at English and French philosophy, there you find a somewhat different line of thinking. But if you deal with many of those men to-day, with Spencer, with Bain, and the rest, you are dealing with a philosophy which has been almost outgrown in the country of its birth, and you are not realising that your own philosophy should be fundamental, and the whole of these foreign forms should be secondary subjects for study among the youths of India. You have in the different schools of your Vedanta and in the lines of philosophy and metaphysics set out by the Musalman doctors and teachers—you have a metaphysic unrivalled in the metaphysics of the world; you have a philosophy

far-reaching and deep. You are neglecting it, while other countries are anxiously gathering it up, and are training their youths along those lines; and I submit that in our colleges and in the higher classes of our schools, the line which is to be taken in philosophy ought to be rather along the indigenous thought than along the Western, and that the Western should be used to enrich and to amplify, but not as a foundation, as it is taken to-day.

Not only is that true in philosophy, but it is still more practically true in history. What sort of history are our boys taught in the schools of the country at the present time? Indian history is a thing which seems to be written as though with the object of disgusting every boy who has to pass an examination in it. Nothing more dry, nothing more uninteresting, nothing more uninspiring, than the school histories of India; nothing to enable the people to realise what India was in her far past, in her near past; yet this is of vital importance for the building of character to-day. How many of your boys and girls know anything really inspiring about the great history of the last two thousand years in India? They may have a few glimpses in their homes of those heroes and saints whose names shine out in the far distant past; but how much do they know of the story of Maharashtra, or Rajputana? how much do they know of the great kingdoms of the south, which were mighty and civilised when Europe was still in mediæval barbarism? That is the history that would inspire your boys and girls. And when you give a particular life to study, whom do you choose as the hero of the biography that you give? Southey's *Life of Nelson*. But why Southey's *Life of Nelson*? Why should an Indian boy gain inspiration from the story of Nelson? Why

should he feel pride in the character or the achievements of Nelson? For an English boy, yes; for Nelson is of his own blood, and stimulates and fires his feelings into patriotism and national pride, but you must give Indian boys Indian heroes and not English ones. Moreover, you must make them realise—most important of all, and for that you will have to rewrite your history—that all the great men of India, no matter what their religion, what their blood, whether they be Musalman or Hindu, that they are all builders of modern India, and that they have a share in the future building of India. You have to rewrite your Indian history as England has written her history, for she has had wars as well as you, internal and civil wars, in the past. There were days when England and Scotland were tearing at each other, as Delhi and Rajputana were tearing at each other in the past in India; and the history is so told that the English boy is as proud of Robert Bruce who defeated England at Bannockburn, and of William Wallace whose head fell on Tower Hill, as the Scottish boy is of Wellington and Nelson.

Many forces go to the building, to the making, of a people, and all who have fought and struggled in the past are builders of the nation of the present, and our boys should learn to love them all. The Hindu should learn to love Akbar; the Musalman, Shivaji. Only so will you make them realise that out of past divisions a nation is being born, and we must honour all the strivers of the past who have made possible the splendours of the future.

And your history lessons have also to be remodelled, so as to contain plenty of Indian matter and less of other nations. Indian boys should learn Indian history chiefly, and the others only to widen out, to strengthen and illuminate the mind.

These changes, then, you need in your literary education, and for these, if you agree with them, it is your personal duty to work. Work by letters to the Press, work by getting into the Senates of your Universities, work by every means that intelligent men can use for the building of public opinion. In fact, you should exert your influence in such a way that the curricula of the Universities and schools should be framed to suit Indian conditions, and to bring about an Indian education enriched by Western thought.

Then you have to take up and press Technical Education; but in taking it up remember that it is no good to educate your boys technically unless you employ them after the education has been gained. Now there lies one of our great difficulties. Many of your boys have gone abroad. They have studied Electrical Engineering, they have studied Civil Engineering, they have taken up studies in glass-making, and many other industries that you find in England and on the Continent. They have faced all the difficulties—you know what they are—of return after foreign travel. They have come back ready to take up work in their Motherland, and they cannot find employment. That is an absolute truth at the present time. India's princes, India's nobles, India's wealthy men, are not doing their duty to the English-educated boys who have gone abroad to study and are coming back practically to starve. Englishmen are given the higher salaries everywhere; but why, when the education given has been the same? I can understand your paying an Englishman more when he has been technically well educated and the Indian young man has not; but when the Indian young man has gained the same education, when he has passed through the same drill and teaching, and

when he returns to his country fully equipped with the technical training he has passed through, why do you choose the Englishman? Why is it said that the Indian must not apply for the larger and more responsible posts, where men have to be organised and where a large business has to be controlled. "Oh!" it is said, "the Indian lacks the power of organisation; the Indian lacks authority." Try him before you condemn him, and give him a chance. I have read, as you have read, all those miserable criticisms that we have had before the late Royal Commission—one of the most mischievous things, I think, which we have ever had in this country, for causing anger and separation between the different races here. But is it not true that wherever an Indian has been tried on equal terms, he has been able to hold his own? If there is a man with power of initiative and organisation, he has no chance here; but let him go to an Indian State, and he will soon show whether he has not the very power that was denied to him, and he proves his capacity by his work All these young men who come back—I am speaking of men that I know—they have practically no chance with their own countrymen, and yet is it not true that in various lines of manufactures you can hold your own against the English, even with the machinery which is theirs, rather than yours? See the great mills in Bombay and in other parts of the country; they can produce and hold their own, even under the disadvantages with which you know they are fettered in their productive industry here.

And so in giving technical education more completely, do not forget that you must have employment for your own educated men, and that you must make a public opinion which will cry shame on the Indian prince or the Indian man of wealth who gives

preference to the foreigner rather than to the man of his own country when he is equally well educated in England.

Technical education, then, to the full is most necessary for the welfare of the country. But when you come to Mass Education, first you have to decide what you are going to teach, and then how you are going to get the means to teach it. I submit, friends, that elementary education ought to be the same for every child, and by elementary, I mean that knowledge which is necessary for the whole life of the future. Reading, writing, arithmetic and so on, these ought to be learnt by all alike. But I want to put to you another thing in the teaching in the elementary schools which, I venture to submit, is important, although at present, so far as I know, no school is really taking it up. I submit that every boy and girl who goes to an elementary school should learn some of the common things of life, which will later inevitably come into the everyday life, whether it be of the shopkeeper, of the merchant, or of the professional man. Children ought all of them to learn those simple things which are carefully left out of our education: how to bind up a cut; how to bind up a sprain; what to do if a burn happens in the household; what to do in more serious cases until a doctor can be called in. All these common things no child is taught, and yet every child should learn the common lessons of everyday life. A large number of your men and women would not be able to tell me how you should put on a bandage if there were a bad bleeding—which was threatening the life of a person before a doctor could be brought—in order to save that life. You would not, most of you, know where to put on the bandage, above or below the wound. The man's life may depend upon it, and

it is a common and a simple thing. You can tell from the way the blood flows and from its colour whether it comes from an artery or from a vein, for according as it is an artery or a vein the bandage must be put on above or below for the checking of the flowing blood. It is a simple thing, but a vital thing sometimes. I was able to save the life of a woman in the London streets by the simple fact that I knew how to put on the kind of bandage which would stop the flow of blood; and the case, the doctor said, would have proved fatal if timely assistance had not been rendered. I only had a handkerchief in my pocket, and I asked the gaping crowd: Who had a piece of stick to give me?—and a carpenter offered a foot-rule, and with the help of that and the handkerchief I checked the bleeding. But then it seemed to me that every person in that helpless crowd ought to have been taught such a simple thing. If there is a common burn, people run about and wonder what they shall do, because of the absence of such kind of education, and this ought to be a part of the teaching in every elementary school.

Some say children are hard to teach. It is because you do not know how to teach them. Every child is always asking questions, which means that he wants to know something about the queer world in which he suddenly finds himself; but when the children ask questions, you say: "Don't bother." When the child says "Why?" you say: "Oh, be quiet," and so you make the child afraid and stop his longing to learn. Teach the child what it wants to know, and not what you want to teach it, and you will very soon find your elementary schools crowded by eager children anxious to learn.

Another thing you must do in your elementary schools, especially the poor schools, is to have medical

inspection. England has only found out lately how much of preventible disease is decimating her schools, and now she has appointed doctors, and every child has to go through a medical examination when it comes into the school, and all the little ailments that grow into permanent diseases are found out by medical examination, and are at once attended to; defects of sight, hearing, etc., all these things are looked after, and all this ought to be done here in India. Wherever there is a school, there should be a medical man to look to the examination of the children in the first instance; not the kind of doctor who cures disease when it is there, but who prevents little defects from growing into permanent and large defects. And that is one thing that you ought to introduce, if I may say so, in your Bombay schools. For you have many difficulties here that England has to deal with in her large cities; crowded rooms, unwholesome air, not well chosen food—these are the things that decimate the children, and that might be so much improved if you looked after the medical examination of the children before they are ill, as carefully as many of you do after disease has stricken them.

Now, how to found these elementary schools, to give this simple training and the necessary practical instruction? That is your big problem, and I can only suggest one or two ways. First, the co-operative movement is spreading. Wherever there is a co-operative society in a village, a village school should form part of that co-operative society. It is not very hard to do. I notice one of your co-operative leaders in Bombay saying that the villagers very soon appreciated the need of learning something after they had come into the co-operative society, and you may do in India what England did by her co-operative movement, where poor men clubbed together, putting

aside so much per cent of their profits for the education of their children. It may be two, three or five per cent; whatever it is, make that educational tax part of the way of spending and distributing the profits of a co-operative society, and wherever you have a co-operative panchayat, add one or two men more for the educational department of it. That you can do without the help of any Government. You can do it in areas of such small size that the cost of it will not be crushing to any particular community.

Then the next step is to appoint village panchayats everywhere, whether the co-operative movement is there or not. Now in this Government is willing to help you. The panchayat saves litigation and heavy expenditure. It saves the Collector rushing about from one place to another, and deciding twenty or thirty suits perhaps in as many minutes for lack of time. It makes over the disputes of the villagers into the hands of people who know the men, who know the rights and the wrongs of the case, as no visitor can possibly know them, however clever he may be; and I believe that by the establishment of the village panchayat system of rule in India, which will from the village unit grow upwards in graded ranks, as also by the establishment of the co-operative societies, you will be able to solve piecemeal the problem of mass education, which is too huge, as I said, for any Government to deal with effectively.

Now that must be done from the towns. Your villagers have the genius for Self-Government. They have shown it for thousands of years. But they have not now the initiative to begin it, and it is to the English-educated class of Indians, it is to them that India must look for the building up of these village units into Self-Government, the founding of the broad

and strong basis on which the national Self-Government hereafter will be building. It is the work for educated men. Take you, then, the work in hand. Many of you have left your own villages, because you are attracted by the towns. You have drawn away the life from the villages by removing the highest class from them and leaving them to the peasants alone. Some of you are Zemindars and draw your livelihood from the villages; but duty goes with privilege, and you have a duty to the villages that support you more than the mere taking of money; and so I would ask the more self-sacrificing of the town-dwellers, those who are able to give some time to it, to put their hands to this plough of national education, to found co-operative societies as you are doing already, to establish panchayats everywhere. Your district committees are in favour of it, but what is the good of resolutions that men pass in the committee and never carry out in the outside world? It is the practical work that the educated amongst you should address themselves to, and you should control that national education and make it what it ought to be for the uplifting of the masses.

I include in this, of course, the education of the depressed classes. That is part and parcel of the question of mass education. Do not make it too literary, or you will only more overcrowd your already overcrowded class of clerks, and you will make a greater pressure still, driving down the salary yet more than it is driven down to-day. Teach in the village schools handicrafts and agriculture. Take in the next schools above them a higher course of agriculture, the teaching of simple chemistry, of the nature of soils and the suitable manures, which will enable them to learn how to improve the soil on which they live. Do not take them away from the village in order

still more to overcrowd the town, but make the life of the village fuller and more prosperous by stimulating the intelligence of the villager. Japan is doing it. During forty years Japan has worked for popular education, and she has now a smaller percentage of illiterates to show than the United States of America, the most highly educated country in the world. What Japan has done, you can do. You may say: "Japan has her own Government." It is not a question of Government; it is a question of people. You can do all this of your own accord if you will. Organise yourselves, and do not leave the Government to do the work that you are not doing. Government cannot do it. You ought to do it. And then your cultivated villagers will form the strength of your nation, and will pay you back in intelligent patriotism that which you spend upon them to-day in effort and in labour.

Women's Education you also have to consider. Now here in Bombay there is not so much to be said about it, for here you realise the value of education for women, and efforts are being made in every direction to improve it. What I would say to you is only to stimulate your efforts towards the advancement of women's education. If you look back into your past history, you will find that your women were well educated along many different lines and walks in life. You will find that, right through the time that we call the Middle Ages in Europe, your girls were educated, some of them fairly highly, in arithmetic and mathematics, and they were well-read in literature, not only what is now called religious, but also what we stupidly call secular. They were trained in household medicine. They knew a great deal about the laws of sanitation, and you will find the older people still, the grandmothers and the

great-grandmothers now, conversant with any amount of household knowledge, which made them the rulers of happy households, well looked after in every respect because of the education of the Indian women. It may not latterly have been of the literary type; it may not latterly have been what we call reading and writing; but if a woman knows medicine, if she knows the value of food-stuffs, if she knows how to deal with the difficulties of a large household, if she has learnt literature by listening to it, not necessarily by reading it, such a woman is a truly educated woman, whether or not she has passed any examinations or holds any University degrees. And that education was very largely spread among those aged grandmothers and great-grandmothers of the immediate past. I know many an English-educated man who looks back to his grandmother for his knowledge of Indian literature and history. She told him the stories of the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata*, and the later stories of the modern heroes of Indian struggle. The men forget, but the women remember, and sing them to their little boys and girls. The man has forgotten them in his so-called education, but they come back to him in his manhood, and he rejoices in what he has learnt in the home. In these latter years the Indian woman's intelligence has come to be recognised as a remarkable thing. Some of us have found that in many cases where some great natural law has been explained, it was seized by a woman when she heard it, and that then she went on applying it in ordinary things, thus bringing it down into real and practical life. Why is it, then, that so many people in India, less I admit on this side than elsewhere, regard women rather as a clog on the nation than as a great uplifting force? It is not the fault of the women, but it is the fault of the men. They have not made common

cause with them in all that interests them in their true life. They have not considered that women have an interest in public life or public affairs, and so they have not talked on what really interests them when they once go inside the women's share of the house. They have left the world outside, and then sometimes the younger of them complain that "our women do not sympathise with us". They know nothing, so how should they sympathise? Look at South Africa, and you will find that there, under the pressure of need, the men shared their anxieties and their aspirations with their wives, and when the time of peril came, the wife went to the jail as willingly as the husband, and she was ready to take her share of hardship and difficulty as gallantly as any man could do. And I believe that that great suffering in South Africa has done more to weld all classes in India together, and to bring her men and women more into line with each other, than anything else which has happened during the last hundred years. It has brought the women out, it has stimulated sympathy between class and class. For so is it that the Gods deal with us, that when we will not go by persuasion, they drive us by suffering into the unity which is necessary for the building of the nation.

And now, summing up all this, you see that in your literary education you want to bring the Indian side out, and use the Western to supplement, except perhaps in matters of science, where the line of teaching in the West is more effective than the line of teaching here. But do not forget that you also have science, and do not let the West entirely drive you out of it. You have an indigenous medicine. You have a knowledge of many scientific facts, you have a psychology greater than the Western, and you should not let these go while you are acquiring other

scientific knowledge from the West. Make the subjects that relate to India first in education, and to other nations second. Then, in the technical education which you give, take the other side of providing a field of employment for the trained young men you turn out, otherwise they become bitter and discontented and add to the difficulties of the country. In your mass education, take village by village, and solve the question slowly, beginning in small manageable areas, building up from the village schools to the University. And in your women's education, give them all that they will take. Train them, and in order to train them, make the marriage age later, for the girl should be at the school with her slate and her book, while here you are putting on her child-shoulders a motherhood that she is utterly unready to discharge.

And so the educational changes will entail the social changes, and that should bring about a better condition of political life; and all for what? Why should I speak to you about education, and urge you to make it a matter for the Nation, and not only a matter for the Government? I speak to you on this because there is one thing that we all are hoping and working for, that great building up of India into one mighty Nation, United India. It is towards that all our efforts should be turning, and we must build up young men and women of character, of courage, of patriotism, and of self-sacrifice, because only out of these elements can a nationality be built. People sometimes say, I saw it the other day in my own paper from the pen of a correspondent, that India is only "a geographical expression". So they said of Italy. Italy was only a geographical expression, until the love of her people, the genius of her poets, the thought of her prophets, united her into the Italy that we know to-day. Germany was only a geogra-

phical expression, but there again it was the poet, the thinker, and the dreamer, who made United Germany possible. The prophet creates the ideal, and the thinker places it before the mass of the people; with the fire of his genius he lights the flame of patriotism, which from the altar of his heart is to spread to the hearts of the people. Now the prophecy of the dreamers that India shall yet be a mighty nation is proving true to-day; forces are at work which are drawing together the people from the Himalayas to Tuticorin, from Assam in the East to Kathiawar on the West; the India of the future lives in our hearts and hopes to-day and she will come down into actuality when her children are worthy of her. And her children call her the Motherland. It is not without significance that here you always speak of the Motherland, not the Fatherland. People say that you do not honour women. I say that in the genius of the Indian people it is the woman, it is the mother, who is raised above all others, and the love for the mother is the deepest in the heart of every man. And so he calls India the Motherland, and not the Fatherland. And when the Indian home is ready, then the Mother shall come to her place; built as she is now as an ideal, she shall become a reality. Around you here on every side are rising up Self-Governing Colonies. And therefore you must make your people to understand and realise the position; you have to build up character; you have to create and build up interest in your women in the Empire that is to come; you have to build from the village upwards; you have to educate from the child up to the man and the woman; for you are building the India of the future, the India that shall be Self-Governing as the Colonies are Self-Governing, the India that shall have the rights of citizenship wherever the Union Jack is flying; the

India that shall be welcomed in every part of the Empire, as she makes all others welcome on her soil. That is the India that is coming, that is the India that is building, and you are the builders who are training the young for her service. They shall reap what you are sowing; they shall build in actuality what you are building in hope and in ideal. You remember what Mr. Gokhale said, words so noble that they can never weary us in their repetition: "It will be for others in the future to serve India by their successes; we must be content to serve her by our failures." I know of no nobler words spoken by nobler patriot, for greater are they who in the dark believe in the dawning, than they who stand in the glory of the sunlight; those who know in the depths of their strong hearts that the dawn shall come and the shadows disappear. Sometimes I look forward to the happier days of to-morrow, when all roads shall be open, when all ways shall be clear, when a vast Empire shall look round on her children filled with patriotism; then men and women in other lands will look back to the days in which we are, and they will say: "We thank them that in the days of fear they still were brave; that in the days of ignorance they still looked forward to the hope; that in the darkness they never forgot the coming light." For it is a grander thing to serve while others stand back, than to take part in the progress of a mighty nation, when all the Empire welcomes the children born of her womb.

III. SOCIAL

THE BEARING OF RELIGIOUS IDEALS ON SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION[1]

In the Middle Ages beliefs were held to be of supreme importance, and a man might die in the odour of sanctity after having poisoned his surroundings with the ill-savour of an evil life. To accept the teachings of the Church was the one thing needful, and she smoothed the way to salvation for the repentant reprobate—repentant because he had no longer strength to sin, and because the fires of hell glowed luridly around his death-bed. So far was this apotheosis of belief carried that the heretic of pure life was regarded as more hateful, because more dangerous, than the evil-doer, as poisonous food would be rendered more attractive when "served up on a clean platter"—the phrase was used, if I remember rightly, in wrath against the heretic Melancthon's blameless life.

Then followed a reaction against this view, and in the days when we, who now are old, were young, it was loudly declared that rightness of [illegible] one important thing, and that it matt[illegible] a man believed provided that his l[illegible] was held that all was well with a man if he acted nobly, and that his beliefs were quite a secondary thing.

[1] Reprinted from *The Theosophist*, December 1912, January 1913.

MEMORI
V.R.NARLA
D.P.R.I.
Acc. No.

The first view—as to the supreme importance of Right Belief—is true; but the belief which is supremely important is that which the man really holds, not that which his lips profess. Bain rightly pointed out that the test of belief is conduct; if a man *believes* that murder and theft will lead him to hell, he will neither slay nor steal; but if he believes that he may murder and thieve in safety, provided that on his death-bed he profess contrition and belief in the articles of the Christian Faith, and that he will thus escape hell, then he will murder and thieve, if his taste leads him in that unpleasing direction. He will look forward to repentance on his death-bed. He may even risk not having a death-bed, if he believes of a brigand, shot as he was riding in one of his forays, that:

> Between the saddle and the ground,
> Mercy he sought, and mercy found.

Arrangements of this kind, enabling an unfortunate man to escape from the unending torture which was supposed to be the result of his temporary ill-doings, were quite necessary while people believed the immoral doctrine of everlasting punishment. The mistake of the Middle Age view was the making of what a man *said* he believed the important test, the test of salvation—not what he really believed. Long before Bain pointed to a man's conduct as the real criterion of the strength of his belief, an ancient scripture had said: "The man consists of his faith; that which his faith is, he is even that."[1] The original Sanskrit phrase is very strong: "Faith-formed this man; whatever faith, that even he."

This vital truth of the forming of character by belief is ignored in the modern view, which exalts

[1] *Bhagavad Gita*, XVII. 3.

character and takes no account of the source whence character springs. If we analyse the case of the Middle Age ruffian, brutal and licentious in his life and repentant on his death-bed, we shall see the utter truth of Sri Krishna's words; he believed that the pardon of the Church, voiced by one of her priests, could prevent him from "dying in mortal sin" and going to hell, no matter how vile his life had been. His conduct was shaped by this belief; he sinned wildly and brutally; he sought pardon on his death-bed; each course of action represented a side of his belief.

The true part of the modern view is the supreme importance of character, and the recognition that, in a universe of law, happiness must ultimately befall the righteous liver: "If a man speaks or acts with a pure thought, happiness follows him, like a shadow that never leaves him."[1] In all worlds it is very well with the righteous man. "By good conduct man attains life. By good conduct he attains fair fame, here and hereafter."[2] "It is your own conduct which will lead you to reward or punishment, as if you had been destined therefor."[3] In the modern view, what are regarded as mere differences of lip-belief are properly regarded as unimportant; it does not really deny the truth that high ideals of life affect character.

The full statement would be: A man's thoughts modify, may even re-create, his innate character, which is the outcome of his thoughts in previous lives; that which he thinks on he becomes. "Man is created by thought." Hence that which he believes, being part of his thought, affects his

[1] *Dhammapada*, I. 2.
[2] *Mahabharata*, Anushasana Parva, CIV
[3] *The Sayings of Muhammad*, 116.

actions, and according to the strength of the belief and the extent to which it occupies his thoughts will be the effect upon his conduct.

Mere lip-beliefs, thoughtlessly accepted from outside and seldom thought about, do not strongly affect conduct; all religions teach the same fundamental principles of ethics, so differences in theological tenets need not much affect conduct. Differences in these are mostly on subjects which do not bear very directly on life, and these differences are, moreover, mostly superficial. Further, they do not largely occupy the mind of the ordinary man. Still, careless and inaccurate thought on these is injurious, and leads to slipshod thinking on other things. To escape this undesirable influence, a man should either form his theological beliefs with extreme care after assiduous study, or should not dwell upon them in his mind, for "that which he thinks upon that he becomes". Sooner or later, thought flows into action.

Hence the enormous importance of ideals, for according to the thoughts brooded over by the mind, cherished in the heart, will be the conduct of the outer life. "Action" is threefold, two parts being invisible and one part visible. Desire breeds it, thought shapes it, act manifests it. An ideal is a fixed idea; it is created by the mind; it is nourished by desire; it presses ever outwardly into the world of manifestation seeking to express itself in action. And inasmuch as the religious ideal is that which comes closest to the heart and most dominates the brain, the bearing of the religious ideals of citizens on the society in which they live cannot safely be disregarded by those who guide such societies. Civilisations are built round a central religious ideal, and are moulded and shaped by the thoughts which flow from it. The ideal which dominated the ancient Aryan root-stock

was Dharma;[1] that which ruled in Egypt was Knowledge; that in Persia, Purity; that in Greece, Beauty; that in Rome, Law; that in Christendom, the Value of the Individual and Self-sacrifice. Each of these ideals shaped a religion and made a type of civilisation, and the evolution of each type only becomes intelligible as this is seen.

In ancient India the central thought was the Family—the man, the woman, the child. Out of this, connoting the duty of each member of the trio to each other member, grew the social ideal of Hinduism—Dharma. The dominant thought of the whole social system is that of mutual obligation; these obligations bind human beings together into a social organism, and the State is a conglomeration of families. The family, not the individual, is the unit, and hence the profound difference between the social ideal of the Indian and of the European. A social system based on the family as the social unit must be a system of mutual obligations, of Duties. A social system based on the individual as the social unit must be a system of mutual contracts, of Rights. The latter is a modern ideal, while the former may be said to dominate the ancient world and the East of to-day, though the East is now being invaded by the Western ideal. Throughout the East, Duties, not Rights, have been the central ideal, the basis of human society; on Duties were built up social systems in which each had his place, his work, his map of life. Looking at these, we realise that human life was once orderly, instead of anarchical; and we begin to see that while the social ideal is that of the struggle of wild beasts in a jungle, social organisation can never rise to a high level.

[1] Dharma is Duty, but far more than Duty. It implies that a man's Duty is shown by his circumstances and character, which are the outcome of his past evolution, and it indicates his best and easiest way of present evolution.

In order to realise the effect of Religious Ideals on a Society growing up around them and dominated by them, we should carefully study the history of the past, bearing this in mind. Let us take for such study the Ideals of Christianity, and the development of European Society under their influence.

Two main Ideals appear to me to be presented by Christianity: (1) The Value of the Individual; (2) Self-sacrifice.

The first of these made the Individual, instead of the Family, the social unit, and, by emphasising the value of the Individual soul, evolved and strengthened the sense of Individuality in man. The immense stress laid on the life here as determining man's everlasting destiny; the submergence of the idea of reincarnation—universal in the ancient world—entailing the permanence of the after-death happiness or misery brought about by the use of that one life on earth, thus magnifying its importance beyond all measure; the substitution of this conception of the overwhelming value of earthly life with its accompanying heaven or hell for that of a continued life, repeatedly circling through the three worlds—physical, intermediate and heavenly—in a long evolutionary process by which, ultimately, perfection was attained; all this inevitably led to the emphasising of the value of the individual possessed of this single chance of salvation; this one, short span of earthly life linked to such gigantic outcome magnified the all-importance of the individual soul. "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" The Christian teaching, based on the Hebraic ideas of the fixed earth with its revolving firmament studded with sun and moon and "the stars also," made man as truly the centre of life as was his earth of the universe.

For man God descended upon earth, took birth in human flesh, and died; man's salvation was God's chief occupation; for man He rose, ascended into heaven, and thence would come again; man's behaviour pleased or grieved Him, made Him content or jealous and wrathful; "God is angry with the wicked every day"; heaven was clouded by man's ill-behaviour, and rejoiced over his contrition. Man's importance became enormous in this scheme of things, and his value rose to an unimaginable figure. If we contrast it with the previous conception of a continued life—with its quiet enduring of present wrong as the outcome of past ill-doing; with its patient striving to plant seeds of qualities which in the future would flower and bear fruit; with its gentle disregard of the fate of a single life which bulked out small in the face of a life everlasting, stretching through a long vista of births and deaths—if we contrast these two conceptions, we shall realise the impetus given to Individuality by the Christian religion, the magnifying of the individual man.

Hence we have, in the West, Individualism as the basis of Society; Man stands alone, isolated, a congeries of inherent, inborn Rights. The apotheosis of the Individual is seen in the assertion of the Rights of Man, and the necessary corollary of a competitive Society; the individual man asserts himself and fights against his fellows; the individual classes struggle with each other; the individual nations war with each other. Each fights for his own hand; each seeks to win by his own individual strength of body or brain that which he desires to possess; competitors in trade carry on cut-throat competition; capitalist and workman fight by lock-out and strike; rival kingdoms seek the bloody arbitrament of war; the weaker nations are exploited for the enriching of the

stronger; trade expansion is forced by conical shot, and markets are opened by the sword; Society becomes a weltering chaos of struggling interests; might is right; the hand of the strong is on the throat of the weak; the helpless is trampled under foot.

Is it, then, ill with the world? Is this cockpit civilisation the result of the teaching of the Gentlest, the most Compassionate, of the Lover of men? Nay, be a little patient, O critic of a great work of art while still half-hewn from the stone. All is very well, despite the outward seeming, for this strong Son of God, who is Man, is but evolving the forces which are necessary for the work which shall be done by Him when the strength which now crushes the weak shall be yoked to their service, and each seed of their pain shall blossom into the splendid flowers of their joy.

For the second Ideal of Christianity, shaped less by ecclesiastical doctrine than by the all-compelling power of a Perfect Life, is that of Self-sacrifice, whereof the Cross is the ever-inspiring symbol;

> . . . . the Cross of Christ
> Is more to us than all His miracles.

The piteous figure of the dying Christ, thorn-crowned and scourged, nail-pierced and naked, was lifted to the heights of unsurpassable command when o'er its pathetic weakness brooded the curbed omnipotence of a God, voluntarily bowing an Immortal Life to a shameful death, and permitting the strong hands which upheld the universe to be nailed by His creatures to the cross. Such was the Figure which silently stood over against Christendom—silently indeed, but there was magic in the silence. Through the storm and the turmoil, through the

struggle and the anguish, a voice was ever softly breathing: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." From the eyes of angry men and weeping women and hungry children shone out the dumb appeal of the eyes of the suffering Christ. Strength was shamed in the moment of its triumph; ruth was stirred when greed should have slept, full-fed. In some wondrous way weakness was seen as being stronger than strength, and pain as sweeter than joy. And then there came to the heart of Christendom the meaning of the forgotten words spoken by its Lord: "He that is the greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is chief as he that serveth . . . I am among you as he that serveth." Then rang out the words of His servant Paul: "We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves." More and more is this Ideal of Self-sacrifice asserting itself in the Christendom of to-day, the Ideal of yoking strength to Service, or recognising the measure of power as the measure of responsibility, of the joy and the glory of voluntary renunciation. That is the Ideal to which the younger generation of the wealthy and the highly placed is stretching out hands aching to serve, is offering up hearts aflame with passionate devotion to man. And that is the Ideal which shall triumph, and shall turn the strength which has been gained in struggle to the uplifting of the trampled, which shall consecrate that strength to the performance of duties instead of to the assertion of rights.

This is the permanent Ideal, while the other is temporary, and shall pass away, having served its purpose, and shall be looked back upon as marking one of the many stages through which man has climbed from savagery to civilisation; it will be seen

clearly in the future—as some already see it to-day—that Society could not endure as a constant battle-field of warring interests, but that there must come a great reconstruction, in which the needs of all shall be reconsidered, the happiness of all shall be aimed at, the extent of possession shall measure the duty of service.

That is the Ideal which, in many different forms, is making its way among the nations of the West. Sometimes it appears in the fierce shape of democratic Socialism, with class-hatred as its inspiration; but hate is a disintegrating force; it cannot construct; and every effort that springs from hatred is doomed to exhaust itself in failure. Side by side with this is another form—a Socialism of love, which aims at giving, but does not exhort to spoliation. It is the noble longing of the happy to bring happiness to the unhappy, of the educated to bring knowledge to the uneducated, of those who have leisure to bring leisure and diminution of toil to those who labour. It is the feeling we call "the social conscience"—a feeling which has its roots in love and sympathy, and which is therefore constructive. For the forces born of love are those which join together, and only a Society which is built on love, and cemented by love, can endure through the ages of the future.

Let us consider what religious Ideal will now serve us as a basis for the reconstruction of Society. What Ideal will suffice to breathe into men's hearts the necessary inspiration for action? Can such an Ideal be presented in a way so precise, clear, intelligible and rational, that it will command the brains of men as well as attract their hearts, that it will give to the social conscience the force of a natural law? Unless this can be done, our labours will largely fail, for we cannot rely for social reconstruction

only on the generous impulses of the noblest and most spiritual men and women. It is necessary that all people should feel that a law exists, accord with which means happiness, and disregard of which brings ruin—slowly or swiftly, but inevitably. For there is nothing which so compels human reason as the sense of an inviolable natural law, working around us, below, above us, a law from which we cannot escape, and to which we must conform ourselves—or suffer. In Society, as in religion and in morals, we must appeal to the reason, we must justify our proposals before the bar of the intellect; only thus can we bring those whose instincts—growing out of the past—are anti-social, to realise that they cannot wisely satisfy those instincts, because such satisfaction would result in a common ruin, in which they, as well as others, would be engulfed.

What religious Ideals, then, are there which may serve as a basis for Society, and may be seen as rooted in natural law, unchangeable and inviolable? First: the One Life. We must realise that we all share a common Life, are rooted in that Life, so that nothing that injures another can be permanently good for any one of us; that the health of the body politic, as much as of the body individual, depends on the healthy working of every part, that if one part is diseased the whole of the body suffers.

On this point science and religion teach the same truth. We can show, from a book on physiology, how the scientific man builds up, in ever more complicated fashion, that which he calls an individual. He recognises that each of our bodies is built up of myriad individuals, each of which lives its own life, was born, grew, died and decayed; it is huge communities of these individuals which make our bodies—plastids or cells he calls them, as they are

walled or unwalled—whether actively moving about in the blood, or comparatively stable; these form the lowest grade of individuals. Then when these are joined together we have the second grade of individuals—tissues. Tissues, joined together, give us the third grade of individuals—organs. Organs joined together make the fourth grade of individuals—plant, animal and human bodies. Bodies joined together make the fifth grade of individuals—communities. Communities joined together make the sixth grade of individuals—nations. Nations joined together, make the seventh grade—Humanity. This is not the teaching of the poet, of the dreamer, of the man fond of allegory, simile, symbol. It is the dry presentment of fact in the physiological handbook. For science, out of the study of diversity, has realised the underlying unity, as religion, beginning with the unity, has divided gradually that unity in training the State, the Family, the Individual. The scientific man regards humanity as an organism, and religion recognises the same idea. Only where science sees one universal Life, religion sees also one universal Consciousness, and calls that Consciousness—God. Religion teaches the Immanence of God: One Life in many forms, One Consciousness in many consciousnesses, One Spirit in many spirits—The ONE individualised for love's sake, for bringing "many sons unto glory".

Thus this idea of One Life in us and in all, One Life expressing itself in countless individuals, is expressed alike by religion and by science. It matters not whether we climb up to a truth from below by countless observations—the Method of Science, or descend into matter from the heights of Spirit—the Method of Religion; both ultimately proclaim the same reality, and this unity of Life, and

therefore of Humanity, may be accepted from either. The recognition of that common life is the only sure basis for the building up of Society in the multiplex individuals that we call nations.

Let us suppose that this thought becomes the dominant thought in all minds; will they not inevitably begin to realise that the health of the whole must depend on the health of the parts? Put poison into the mouth, and the whole body suffers. Inject it into a vein, and the whole body is sick. Allow poverty, misery, ignorance, to spread abroad in your body politic, and the whole body politic becomes diseased, and there is no sound health in it. A belief in the Immanence of God compels the recognition of the Solidarity of Man: "There is one Spirit *and One Body*." The second truth is only the earth-side of the first. Hence any scheme of social reconstruction that is to endure must be based on the practical recognition of a common Life in which all are sharers. That means that there must be no slums, and no plague-spots of vice in our cities; it means the disappearance of the frightful poverty which gnaws at the life of millions of our fellow-beings. It means such a recognition, such a realisation, of the common Life, that we who are cultured and comfortable shall feel diseased and tortured unless we are doing our utmost to relieve our brothers and sisters from suffering; a realised common Life cannot rest content while there is so much agony unregarded.

This is felt in blood-relationship. There is no need of law to compel a brother to assist a brother; the law of love in the heart negates the need for any other law, and compels us to carry help to a suffering member of the family. And it is true that "God hath made of one blood" all the children of men; and until we feel for those outside the blood-family

as we feel for those within, until for us all form one family, until—in the phrase of an old Hindu scripture—we regard all the elders as our parents, the contemporaries as our brothers and sisters, the youngers as our children, we have not really risen to the *human* point of view at all. For in true men and women, the sense of love, compassion and sympthy—of Service, in a word—stretches over earth, through death, and back to earth again, and just in proportion as we have evolved this quality in far-reaching benevolence are we truly Man.

As this truth becomes generally recognised, all who suffer will have an indefeasible claim on all who are able to help, by the mere *fact* of their suffering; instead of running away from the sight of suffering, and trying to forget it, as so many do to-day, we shall allow the suffering to wring our hearts until we have removed it from another. We shall live out the exquisite words of that gem of literature, *The Voice of the Silence*, given to us by H. P. Blavatsky: "Let not the fierce sun dry one tear of pain before thyself hast wiped it from the sufferer's eye. But let each burning human tear drop on thy heart and there remain; nor ever brush it off until the pain that caused it is removed." And it is written: "To live to benefit mankind is *the first step*."

As this Ideal begins to rule, the sense of true Solidarity will arise, and Society will be built in full recognition of the law that social health depends on the health of every individual in Society, that it is not enough that some should be successful, but that all must have their share of happy life. Without this, Society perishes. The law of the common Life, the expression of which is Brotherhood, is woven into the very substance of the human race. There have been many Empires, many Kingdoms in the past, and

they have all broken up when they denied the law of Brotherhood. Where Brotherhood is ignored, it breaks that which ignores it. Empires have been builded by King-Initiates, and have lasted for thousands of years in happiness and prosperity; but when, in later days, selfishness grasped the sceptre, the Empire slowly crumbled into dust.

The first Ideal, then, which is necessary for Social Reconstruction, is the Unity of Life—we are all one. None can suffer in the body politic without the happiness of all being tainted; success and failure are common for the whole of us; while to ignore the law may for a brief time bring success, in the long run it inevitably brings destruction. A man takes advantage of his fellow man, builds up his own business by the destruction of the business of his neighbours, gathers together money by injuring, not by serving, those around him. Perhaps as a lawyer he is unjust, unfair, and wins his cases and fame and fortune by unjust and unfair pleadings in our Courts. The result is that the standard of morality of the nation is lowered. Commerce and trade become rotten, and no man can really trust his neighbour; for the tricks of business and trade are played, and people know it. As mistrust gradually spreads through the people, prosperity sinks lower and lower; and the children and grandchildren of the successful but dishonest man share in the degradation of the whole nation. For the poison that he put into the veins of the nation has gradually spread through the whole body, and the whole is sick and degraded: the national life becomes polluted and devitalised, and every one suffers. The wealth he gained by wrong is scattered, and the family, for which he cheated and saved, sinks down in the general national decay.

Another religious Ideal, needed especially for the actual work of Social Reconstruction, is the joy and glory of Sacrifice. This again is beautifully seen in the family. No compulsion is there needed. Where food goes short, the youngest children are the first to be fed. The baby is the last to be neglected, when pressure comes upon the family resources: for, instinctively, the elders feel that the burden must not fall on the weaker shoulders, while they are there to bear it in their stead. Sacrifice is seen not to be sorrow, but a healthy instinct of the true human heart, and wherever it meets weakness there comes the impulse to serve.

And if this were carried out in the reconstruction of Society, what would be the result? No longer then would most be expected from the weakest, nor would the bearing of the heaviest burdens be put on the shoulders least fitted to sustain them. Who, in our Society, are those who most need something of the ease of life—good food, good clothing, good shelter, and leisure that will truly re-create? Surely it is those who toil—those who are giving their strength to production, and who for long hours labour for the common helping. And yet those, under our present system, are the worst fed worst clothed, worst housed. It is far harder for a man, exhausted by eight, nine, ten hours of labour, to go home to a slum where the air is foul and the surroundings repulsive, than it would be for one less exhausted. It may be said that he feels it less than would one accustomed to other life. That is true, for habit dulls. But is not this the heaviest condemnation of our social system, that we have crushed our workers down to the point where they do *not* feel sufficiently acutely the evil conditions of their lives? We force them to be

less than human, and then plead their lack of refined humanity as an excuse for leaving them as they are.

Modern civilisation has failed to make the masses of the people happy. Look at the faces of the poor; they are the faces of saddened and weary people, weary with the burden of life. Until the people are happy, we have no right to talk of "Society"; there is only a weltering chaos of social units, with no social organisation. But gradually we shall take the social question in hand, and aim at the realisation of the splendid phrase: "*From* each according to his capacity; *to* each according to his needs." That is the Law of the Family, and one day it will be the Law of the State; for it is the true social law. As the truth of reincarnation becomes accepted once more, the duty of the elders to the youngers, the claim of the youngers on the elders, will be recognised; help, protection and training will be gladly rendered by the elders, and the evolution of the youngers will be quickened.

This can only come about by religious effort and the religious spirit. Not out of the Ideal of material prosperity but out of the religious Ideal must spring the Sacrifice that is joy, because it is the conscious expression of the common life; only out of the religious Ideal can come the Brotherhood which exists in all its splendour in the spiritual world, and, in time, shall surely spread to us in this mortal sphere. It is the spiritual sight which is the true vision; and the testimony of the spiritual consciousness, which has been so ignored in the West, is beginning to be seen as an asset in human Society. That spiritual consciousness always speaks for Unity, for Brotherhood, for Service and for Sacrifice; as it unfolds, it will bring the materials for a nobler social State.

The Immanence of God; the duty of the strong to serve and to protect; the linking together of power and responsibility; the realisation that the higher and stronger should put forward no rights—that rights belong to the weaker and the more helpless; these Ideals, as they are recognised, will regenerate Society, and will stimulate the noblest emotions of the human heart to love, to help and to serve. There will be no need of confiscatory legislation, for the heart full of love will be the law of life; it will be a question of giving not of taking, of voluntary help not of compelled drudgery. Then will the danger of warfare pass away, and peace, which is the fruit of love, will spread over the lands. In the unity realised by religion, the apparently conflicting interests of men on the material plane will disappear, and as the Spirit of Love dominates, the discords caused by hatred ke pass away.

THE NECESSITY FOR SOCIAL REFORM[1]

I

There is perhaps no question of more pressing importance for India than the question of social reform. It is necessary in the course of evolution that every living religion shall adapt itself to the change of the conditions of the times in which it finds itself. A religion which cannot adapt itself is one whose work is practically over. If, as I believe, Hinduism is a living religion as much now as it was thousands of years ago, then we shall find that as Hinduism in the past adapted itself to new conditions, carrying on the essentials, while changing the unimportant details, so in the present time, in the immense changes that are passing over the world, Hinduism will be able to adapt itself to the changing conditions of the times and still remain the dominant note of Indian civilisation, showing itself capable of guiding India in the future as it has guided it from an immemorial past. There is nothing which is clearer and plainer, when we study the history of India, than that from time to time great changes have come over her civilisation, that she has been able to assimilate new thought and new ideas without losing her own fundamental type; and some of you may remember that in the closing words of the *Institutes of Manu*, where the great Lawgiver, conscious of the changes which inevitably would be brought about in the course of millennia, advised

[1] A lecture, reprinted from *The Commonweal*, Sept. 18th and 25th 1914.

that when the times had changed and those laws were no longer useful for the community, a council of learned men should be gathered together, who should make the changes which were necessary for the welfare of the people. (See xii, 108 *et seq.*)

The view of possibilities of wide change is far from the mind of the modern Hindu, and he is inclined to feel that when he makes some new departure suitable for new conditions, he is almost obliged to drop his ancestral religion, and rather to introduce a new social custom against his idea of religion than, as it ought to be, in full consonance with the deeper and spiritual view. But one of the difficulties in our way is that the modern Hindu knows so very little about his own history. History, so far as India is concerned, is practically not taught in our schools at all; for I do not call it Indian history, when we simply ta up some miserable little book with a list of battles and kings and dates and outer events, with nothing to show the unfolding life of the people. It is not really studying history to study it as it is studied in our schools of the present day, and to read Indian history as Indian boys read it now is practically to give them a distaste for the whole of their country's past. You have to remember, in thinking of history, that what you need is to fire the boys' thoughts, to give them the sense of patriotism, to enable them to realise that the present is the natural outgrowth from the past; whereas you would think from many histories that India had no history until John Company came here and founded its factories in Madras, in Bombay, and Calcutta. You would imagine the whole of the mighty past of India was practically unimportant, and that all the great civilisation of the past is a matter that can be entirely ignored in building up the present and the future.

Now, as a matter of fact, if you go into Indian history at all, you will at once realise that the Nation that built up that history so many thousands of years ago, is a Nation with a typical life of its own. It is capable of steady and constant evolution to-day. You would realise that so far from the idea of Self-Government being a new idea, which has grown out of contact with Great Britain, which has gradually been adopted by the educated Indians because they have studied English History—you would find, on the contrary, that India was one of the most Self-Governing countries in the world, and that there still remains in village traditions in India the memory of a time when the people truly governed themselves. And if you study that, not only in the village communal life, but if you study the building up from the village to the ten villages, from the ten villages to the hundred villages, and so on, grade after grade, until you come to the royal power, you would see in that the image of a Nation that was not only capable of Self-Government, but that exercised Self-Government; you would realise that Kingship in India, powerful as it was, was powerful because the King was frequently elected by the people; because no great step was taken without the popular approval; because round the King there stood a Council, representing the various grades in the community over which the King was ruling. And you find as you read those old stories that, while the King was mighty, he was the King of a Free State, and you begin to realise that a great deal of the nonsense talked in modern times about India's incapacity for Self-Government *is* nonsense, and grows out of the ignorance of the people, and their utter lack of acquaintance with the past of their own great Nationality.

Moreover, if you study that history, you would find that customs had changed in the most extraordinary

way. You would find, when you came to deal with the question of foreign travel, that India was once a great commercial country, manufacturing her own products, and sending them out in her own ships over the whole of the then known world; you would find that there was a great trade carried on with Europe along the borders of the Mediterranean; you would find your sailors sailing over all the seas of the then known world, and carrying the products of Indian handicrafts over the whole of that then known civilised world. If you want to know the details take such a book as Professor Radhakumud Mukerji's *Indian Shipping*, and that will open your eyes to what India was as a commercial Nation —not only sending caravans across by Persia and Arabia, but having ships that sailed everywhere, and that carried with them the products of Indian labour. And the difficulty of anyone who speaks about Social Reform to-day is that it is taken for granted that the present views are orthodox, that they are the traditions and views of Indians coming out of the past, whereas they are really modern, and not orthodox, restrictions. In the old times there were continual changes, the Nation suiting itself to the conditions of the times and not permitting itself to be bound in the fetters which modern ignorance has put around the limbs of modern Hindus.

Now I want this evening, if I can, to show you that some of the most important points of Social Reform are, comparatively, of this age, that they have grown up in later days, that they have no part in the old India, no real authority in the ancient literature. In some cases there is authority going far back, and those I shall distinguish, and I propose to begin with one point that is in many ways the most important of all. The view of caste,

as you find it in modern days, the views that were held in the past, the way those originated, and the way in which for many, many millennia it acted as a kind of ark which carried India over many waters of invasion and of change which otherwise might have destroyed the Nation, these all have to be realised. It is not because an institution is being outgrown, that it ought to be looked upon as valueless in the past. I do not believe that anything but caste could possibly have carried the Indian Nation over many of the difficulties across which it has had to come; but I want to show, if I can, that caste was not originally present in Hinduism, that it was adopted for perfectly good reasons and to bring about a desirable condition of things, that it is real as long as you have quality present in the caste, marking it out as distinct, but that it becomes unreal the moment quality has disappeared, and you find merely the outside characteristic of birth and not the inner characteristic of qualities.

Now first, as to its origin. It is entirely beyond all doubt that in the earliest settlements of the Aryan people, you find they were without caste—you find in every Purana that in the Satya Yuga, the first great Yuga which is supposed to be the best of all, there was no caste; and the reason why there should be no caste then, although that reason is not on the surface, was that all Aryans are by physical descent the children of Manu. Because He is the literal Progenitor, He is the ancestor of the whole of the Aryan stock. And naturally, as long as that was recognised, it was impossible to separate the people out into varieties of caste divisions, when the descent from the one great Lawgiver was the very mark of the Āryan birthright. And although no stress is laid upon that in the Puranas, and, later on, in the Puranas you find different progenitors for different castes, still you

have the main fact coming out that in the earliest age there was no caste at all. It is well to lay stress upon that, because so many people say that caste is essential to Hinduism, whereas we find Hinduism, the religion of the children of Manu, existing before caste was ordained. Still following the same line of Pauranic history, we find that caste grew up, and grew up by difference of qualities, as you might expect. There are certain fundamental differences of qualities in human beings. Whether those are marked out by outer caste or not, they exist; they are of everlasting value in the human race; and go where you will, take what nation you please, the four great fundamental lines of caste qualities are everywhere to be seen. You see one in the great class of teachers—a marked class in every nation—the learned men, the men who study the philosophies, the metaphysics, and so on, including the teachers in University, college and school. That is a distinct class, marked out by the capacity for learning, and by the faculty for passing on to others that which they themselves know. These are the Brahmanas. Then we come to the next type, the type that guards civic order and protects the land against invasion, the class of law-makers, of rulers, including the army, the navy, the police force, the whole of those whom here we call the Kshattriya caste, the legislative, the ruling caste. Then inevitably your next type, the trading, the commercial, the organisers of industry, those who carry on commerce and trade, those who organise production, those who organise distribution, and so on. Those are a great organ in the nation's life. And lastly, everywhere, the manual workers, those who produce all the necessaries for the community, those who are labourers, those who weave and sow, those form the fourth great class in every community. These differences are fundamental. They are not religious

and artificial in any sense, they are natural and permanent. It does not matter what nation you go to, those classes are everywhere found, and their differences of life, of learning, of habit, of culture, mark them out as separate the one from the other in any nation to the study of which you may turn. Now the great difference between India and the other communities of the civilised world has lain in the fact that the natural division was recognised as a birth division. And you have the statement of Shri Krishna in the *Bhagavad Gita*: "I emanated the castes according to qualities." As the Hindu nation developed, these qualities were marked everywhere; they were adopted by the lawgivers and marked out distinct castes or classes; and in the admirable organisation of the Hindu people, birth and quality were developed together, advantage being taken of the law of heredity to preserve each type. The birth of the child, the dharma of the child—these two things were evolved side by side, and definitely preserved by divine ordination and guidance.[1] Birth was recognised in order to make by heredity a fitting body for the qualities which were seeking embodiment. And so you had in India, as there was not to the same extent anywhere else, the distinct declaration of the fundamental types of human kind, and the forbiddal of intermarriage outside each particular type. Now that forbiddal was intended to use heredity for the building up of special types, and appears to have been ordained by the Manu in order to prevent the swamping of the Aryan minority in the vast masses of the aboriginal populations of India. Nothing except the forbiddal of intermarriage could possibly have enabled the Aryan blood to survive.

[1] Those who realise that the laws of Nature are the expressions of Intelligences will realise how a typical ego was guided to a typical family for his body.

Even as it is, with all the forbiddal, you see how much of intermixture there has been. For if you look at the question ethnologically, you find the marks of mixture in the faces and the bodies of the people as the result of very widespread intermarriage, despite the fact that it was forbidden by the Hindu religion. Come down South, if you like, and you will find two types of the Brahmana caste. One, the pure Aryan, recognisable at once on sight; the other mixed Dravidian Aryans and others, where you can tell by the shape of the face, by the breadth of the nostrils, and by the formation of the mouth, that there has been a great intermixture of other types with the Aryan blood which was in the conquering race. You cannot forge human types; you cannot manufacture, as it were, against the law of heredity, any special form of feature, and type of face. And when you find, as you find so largely in the South, that a very large number of the Brahmana caste bear on their faces the marks of mixed descent, you realise that caste has become a name, a matter of orthodoxy, and that not only have the castes forsaken their own particular duties, but there has been a wide intermixture of different bloods, and that the pure Aryan is still in a minority in India.

Far more important than that, however, for that is a question of physical descent, is the question of qualities in relation to caste. There is no caste, it is written over and over again, unless birth and quality go together. Take the famous passages in the *Mahabharata* with which you must all be familiar, that a Brahmana who shows the qualities of a Shudra is a Shudra and not a Brahmana ; that the Shudra who shows the quality of a Brahmana is a Brahmana and not a Shudra. The quality must go with the caste, otherwise caste becomes an hyprocrisy and

not an orthodoxy. Now look for a moment at what heredity has done. It has done one thing for the Brahmana caste ; has developed a type of brain unique in the whole world. There is no type of brain similar to the Brahmana brain through all the civilised nations of the world. It is a type so acute, keen, logical, extraordinarily able, and you find it spread over large numbers of the caste; it is not one here and there; it is an average height of attainment which, when you come to study it carefully, is marvellous in its extent. It does not matter to the Brahmana caste here, really, whether or not it is recognised as leader by virtue of birth. You might destroy all caste privilege to-morrow, and none the less the Brahmana brain would hold its own as the great leader of the people. I do not mean that every Brahmana shows it; I do not even mean that you do not find the type occasionally outside the Brahmana caste; but if you take the average type, you find it recognisable among the human types of the world. But now the Brahmanas have been doing their best for a very, very long time to destroy their own caste. For they have thrown away that which made them great, and they have been taking up all other kinds of life and work. Wherever you go in India you still find the Brahmana leading, but not always leading in learning. You find them at the bar—the majority of the distinctly clever Vakils are Brahmanas. But when did Law and the practice of Law in the courts, when did that become part of the Dharma of the Brahmana? When was that laid down in Hindu Law as one of the characteristics of the Brahmana; and yet you find your greatest Indian Judges are Brahmanas, your keenest Vakils are Brahmanas. And wherever I go, I find the Vakils are the leading men of the population in all matters of public service, in all matters of self-sacrifice. Yet most certainly Law

belongs to the Kshattriya and not to the Brahmana. The Brahmana who is a lawyer is distinctly cursed by Manu; and although the Brahmana Vakil will quote Manu when it suits him, in order to win a case, the very law that he quotes strikes the foundation of his profession from under his feet—he has no right to be a lawyer, he being a Brahmana. Then you find a good many of your clever doctors are Brahmanas. But to be a doctor is to be cursed by Manu. A Brahmana has no business to be a healer of men. The Brahmana has to be poor; but there are many of your richest men who are Brahmanas; a lawyer in Calcutta gets more than ten thousand a month by a good practice. He hasn't a Hindu right to a rupee of it—it is all outside his dharma; he ought to be very poor; he ought to come in two cloths; he ought to be full of vaidik knowledge; he ought to employ himself entirely in teaching. Why, if the Brahmana did his duty, we should have no trouble about mass education to-day, for we should have one or two teachers in every village, and they would train the masses.

II

The truth is that the whole of caste is one great confusion now—it is not real; and when a thing is not real, it ought not to endure. You know I feel so strongly the value that caste used to have, that I have tried very hard to persuade people to take up again the dharma of their caste. But it is impossible. The times are too strong, the men themselves are not willing to do it. And there is another point in which caste has very much changed in the present time. There was no such thing known in ancient India as caste by itself—Varna. Varna and Ashrama always go together—the Hindu polity is Varnashrama, not

Varna separately, and that is a point more important than you may realise. The Guru had as pupils twice-born boys; he had pupils of the three twice-born castes; they were all his pupils from the time of the giving of the sacred thread. Now all these pupils lived together, read through their Brahmacharya Ashrama together; they went about begging for food; they took food from the various houses of the community in which they lived; the food was brought back by the students to the Guru, who divided it all amongst them. They ate together; no distinction of caste was known while the pupil was in the house of the Guru. The result was that in boyhood the castes lived together, they grew up together, they studied together, they ate together, they slept together; so no caste during their boyhood made a dividing line between the pupils of the same Guru. Then came the time when the boy was to be married—his education was over. Now began the Grihastha Ashrama, the household life. Then caste asserted itself at once. In the household life caste was recognised, for children were to be born, and hereditary race to be preserved, and the four castes were seen definitely in that part of life. When the household life was over, then came the Vanaprastha, where again caste disappeared, and finally Sannyasa where obviously no caste showed itself. In three of the divisions into which the life of the Hindu was divided, there was no caste observance, and only in the household life was caste carefully regarded, because needed for heredity. Where children were not concerned, caste was ignored. Even in the household life it was not so rigid as it is now. What does Manu say? You may take food from the servant of your own house, from your own ploughman; why? Because the taking of food in the old days was based on a principle. Where the life was clean, where men and

women led a pure and decent life, where you knew your own servant's life, and knew it to be well and decently lived, there you could take food from him; for it is true that the magnetism of the man affects the food, and so has much to do with the building up of a pure body. But in your modern way of having Brahmanas for your cooks, you do not think of his life but of his birth. You would rather take food from a profligate Brahmana than from a decent Shudra. There is no reason nor sense in that; it is not the old law but a modern prejudice, and where you have prejudice instead of reason, then it is time for a custom to come to an end.

When you are dealing with caste changes you cannot leave out the foreign travel question. A number of lads go abroad; unless they do so they cannot take up the best positions in their own country; the higher positions in the various branches of the learned professions are barred to all of you, unless you go abroad. And so you send your sons abroad. If they are to enter the Indian Medical Service, they must go to England and pass their medical training there; if they are to be in the Indian Civil Service, they must go to England and there they must gain their education, if they are to enter the higher ranks of the Indian Educational Service, to England they must go in order to gain the qualifications which enable them to take a position in the Educational Service of their own country. Everywhere this is the case, and you want therefore to send your cleverest boys abroad, and when they come back they are outcasted. I know the thing is not as bad as it used to be, but it is bad still. Take the case which began by Ayodhia Das going abroad and becoming a barrister. When he came back his relatives took food with him, and they were challenged;

he was outcasted and some of his relatives also. Then came another case in Benares, where one of our own professors went abroad and came back and some of the younger men dined with him; and then you had the great excommunication of a number of them, resulting in the excluding from the caste community of three or four of the most eminent of the citizens of Benares. Now Babu Govinda Das Sahab has been fighting that case ever since. You know that in the first case a learned Hindu Judge decided that a man might go across the black water and be received back into caste. Then it went to Allahabad to the High Court; and you have a Christian and a Musalman Judge deciding on the question, obviously knowing very little about it, and deciding it on what in England we should call club rules—that is, in the voluntary association of a club you may exclude a person who does not follow the rules. The fact that a man is born into caste, that he cannot escape it, the fact that it gives a weapon of persecution against the most reputable members of the caste—they may be turned out if they dine with an Englishman—all this was ignored.

The case may be going up to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—I hope it will, as then there may be a reversal of a cruel wrong. Present conditions mean that a man has to spend tens of thousands of rupees to prevent himself being made a social leper, so that he cannot marry his sons and daughters, so that he is excluded from social festivals and gatherings—a thing like that cannot endure. Impossible that the brightest brains should be excluded in that way when they come back; and although it is true that things are not so bad now as they were ten or twenty years ago, none the less the number of outcastes is increasing, and you are practically having

another caste of England-returned men, the brightest and the cleverest of the population, who are standing outside the ordinary Indian social life. Where that happens, it shows that social life is decaying, and it is better to recognise the thing straightforwardly and honourably than it is to go along in the foolish way that Indian Society is doing now—despising the hypocrisy in its heart, while outside it pays it a certain respect. And that question of foreign travel will become of greater and greater importance. For the first time we have troops going to Europe to fight side by side with British troops for the safety of the Empire. What are you going to do with them when they come back? Are you going to treat them as outcastes—the men who have made the Empire safe? They are giving their strength, they are giving their lives; are they to be treated as outcastes, those who come back, covered with the glory that they have won, and honoured by the whole Empire outside India? Is India going to treat her heroes as outcastes, because they have gone across the sea to fight for the safety of their country and the Empire? And as you become a part of the World-Empire, how are you going to play your part in the Empire of to-morrow, unless you are free to go over the whole world, among all nations and all peoples, to study them, to understand them, to learn their ways, their customs and habits? Does it strike you that you have to grow into an Imperial Nation? The Empire that is coming is going to be a federation of Self-Governing communities, and India will be one of those communties. India is growing up into Self-Government, and none can say her nay. Presently she will be having her National Parliament in addition to the Provincial Parliaments; but when you have a National Parliament, when like the other Dominions you have your Parliament governing the Indian land, that is not the limit of your ambition; that is not the

end of your place in the Empire. You will have to elect some of your own race, some of your own people, to represent India in the Council of the Empire, to be part of the great Imperial Parliament, which shall guide the destinies of the Empire as a whole. How are you going to do that, if you know nothing about the other Nations? How are you going to breed Imperial statesmen, unless you travel freely and study other lands and other countries, and learn the ways in which they think, and the ways in which they live? You need the education of foreign travel in order to play your future part in this World-Empire into which you are entering. For the first time your place in it is recognised. Did you notice the other day in Parliament that, when speaking of the Empire, they no longer spoke of India as the "great Dependency" we have so often heard of? They spoke of the Dominions Overseas, India, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, etc. Never before has India been given in that way her equal place among the great communities that make up the Empire, and that recognition once given will never be taken back. Never again will it be possible to put India on an inferior footing as a subject race, as they used to say. But you must grow up to that; you cannot grow up to it, if you keep a social organisation which is out of touch with the whole of the social order of the civilised world. You have to eat with other people, and you have to meet them on an equal footing; you have to associate with men and women on a footing of social equality. You have to realise that you are a Nation among Nations, and that you cannot have a social organisation apart from all the rest of the civilised world, and separate yourself socially from the people with whom you are to share the direction and the government of your own country and of the Empire at large.

These are some of the things that make the necessity for social reform. You might keep your own organisation apart from others as long as you were confined within your own borders; but now that you are becoming a Nation among Nations, now that you are taking your place in a federal Empire which is building, you must be ready to meet other Nations on a footing of equality, and you must learn to live with them as they must learn to live with you. There lies the fundamental necessity, and the problem is: How much of that which is valuable in the old organisation can you carry over into the new? You do not want to lose anything which is valuable; your ideals are of priceless value to humanity at large, but you have to distinguish between the passing and the lasting elements in your National life, to separate off those that are no longer useful, to preserve those that are valuable as elements in a Nation.

But there is one point I would ask you not to forget when you are dealing with the question of intermarriage. Race is a reality, and you cannot ignore it. You say there is no caste in England; but in England it is not the habit of the nobleman's or the gentleman's daughter to marry a workman, or one inferior to her in education and in culture. Race *is* important: it is important in the plant, in the animal, and it is also important in the man; and you must recognise the law of heredity, although you may say that it is no longer carried out under the name of caste. General avoidance of intermarriage is vital for a Nation's future.

That brings me to another point of Social Reform on which public attention has gone far; I mean the making of the marriage age later than it is now. Practically, educated opinion is almost at one on that point. But custom does not conform to the opinion.

I am afraid I have met many men who were Social Reformers on the platform, speaking in favour of a later marriage, and yet marrying their daughters, their girl-children, at an age when they were utterly unfit for marriage. The marriage age should be decided by physiological development, that which God has written in the bodies of men and women. The prevalence of diabetes among your educated classes, the fact that many of you are middle-aged when you ought to be young, and old when you should be middle-aged—the lack of energy and bodily vigour in Indians from fifty years of age onwards, when the brain ought to be at its brightest and strongest, when the nervous system ought to be at its best and keenest, that is a definite answer to the marriage of boys and girls in this country—the motherhood of girl-children, the fatherhood of young boys. That is a thing on which India's life depends as a Nation, and she cannot survive if you marry your boys and girls as you are doing now. Why, down in Madras we have girl widows under one year of age! A baby married in the cradle, and then doomed to widowhood for life. Take the Census report. See that we have there widows under five years of age counted by the thousand. Realise that the death age of your wives between fifteen and twenty-five leaps up suddenly because of premature motherhood. These are crimes! Preventible death is murder, and every one of you who gives a child of twelve or thirteen into the arms of the husband, so that, when she is thirteen or fourteen years of age, she becomes the mother of a child, every one of you is committing this crime against nature, in the person of your girl-child. It is a cruelty, and it is only custom that blinds you to the horror of it. You know how many first children are born dead of child-mothers; you know how many child-mothers

go through an agony to which no girl should be subjected in the bearing of the first child. You are so accustomed to it that you do not think of it; you have a festival of marriage, and you give the little girl away—you the father, who ought to guard her, who ought to protect her from the wickedness of premature motherhood! And the curse comes down on the Nation because of it, the premature old age, the rapid death of girls becoming early mothers. You know that all the bloom of a wife of twenty-five is gone; she is middle-aged although still so young. They die; and then you have men marrying over and over again. You don't care about the sacredness of marriage; men may have half a dozen wives one after another, and still marriage is supposed to be a sacred institution; but the girl-child, she must be a widow for life, although perhaps she never saw the husband except in the moment of the marriage ceremony. And then you have the horror of old men marrying children, a man of fifty marrying a child of ten. It is these things which dishonour Hindu marriage in the eyes of the world. Hindu marriage is the noblest type of marriage in its theory, that any nation has held; one man to one woman; says Manu: "Let mutual fidelity continue until death." There is no ideal of marriage anywhere known, which is more exquisitely beautiful than the Hindu ideal; but it is trampled in the mud by these modern ways of dealing with it, desecrating it by the marriage of the child, dishonouring it by marriage of an old man to a girl young enough to be his grandchild. These are the things that Hindu men should take in hand and crush. If you do that you will be able to educate your girls longer. They will be able to remain at school, because they will not be taken from the school in order to undergo premature motherhood, and on the education of India's women depends the raising of the Indian

Nation. You cannot, with uneducated mothers, have a race of patriots and of heroes. It was the mothers of India in the past who made the great India of the past—the great women of India who made India what she was in the ancient days. And they have the power now. I am not sure that the Indian woman's brain is not more brilliant than the brain of the man; extremely bright and clever are the Indian women of to-day; and if you give them the stimulus, the opportunity, they will shine out before the world as models of great womanhood.

Thus there lies before you this path of reform to tread or not as you will. Every Nation is given its opportunity, but none can force it to tread the upward path. You have to modify your caste; you have to take foreign travel as a matter of course; you have to educate your women; you have to educate the masses of your people; you have to do away with child-marriage. These great reforms you have to bring about. The Nation's life depends on them; and remember that the Indian Nation does not live for itself alone; it is a type unique among all the Nations of the world. It knows how to join spirituality to intellect, intellect to physical prosperity, and so to build up the Nation on all sides.

Great as you have been in the past, your future greatness may be greater still. India in the past was mighty; but India in the future—that shall be a Nation grander than the world has ever dreamed of, if only Indians are true to themselves. But one thing you must remember; that none outside yourselves can make India what she ought to be. No tongue of a foreigner can build India. It is Indians themselves must build their Nation, and they alone can make India what she ought to be, what she shall be in the days to come. No Government, no power, no

friendship, no amount of eloquence, can make a Nation. It is the men and women of the Nation only who can build it.

It is in the schools and colleges of India that young India is learning the lessons that it shall practise when it comes to manhood and womanhood. In the young is our hope; and if we can only inspire *them* with love of their Motherland, if we can only win *them* to realise what it is to be a citizen of a mighty and free Nation, then out of our schools and colleges there shall grow the India of the future. And to us who have believed in her coming ere yet she has appeared; to us she will look back as those who worked for her in the darkness; and she will realise that we too have had a share in the laying of the strong foundation on which Indian men and women, who are boys and girls to-day, will raise the great edifice of India's Freedom, and make India the Motherland glorious among the Nations of the world.

EASTERN CASTES AND WESTERN CLASSES[1]

I AM to speak to you this afternoon on class distinctions, whether in the East or in the West. I am going to try to show you that these distinctions exist and have existed from time immemorial, and are based upon natural divisions; and I am going to compare them as I find them in the East and in the West, as I find them in the past and in the present, because I hold that one of the duties of men is to learn experience from past errors, and to choose in the present and the future by the light of the experience that lies behind; so that in dealing with the subject which both in the East and in the West is raising much discussion and much bitter and antagonistic feeling, I want to take the Caste system on the one side, the Class system upon the other side; to look at both these systems in the past, to look at both these systems in the present, so that thus judging we may decide on our future, and see what modifications are necessary, what principles are to guide us, in order to improve our national condition and to raise and strengthen our national life.

First of all I suggest to you that there are certain natural divisions that you find in every nation, no matter what may be the social system, the form of government, the religion, or the political constitution of the people. There are four great natural divisions

[1] A lecture delivered in 1895.

alike all over the world, without which no society can exist, without which no national life can be carried on; that come to the surface in every nation, although in one nation the arrangement may be recognised and, in another, arrangement in name may be disregarded. These natural divisions are: first of all a large number of people employed in production in order that men's bodies may be kept alive, in order that food, clothing and shelter and other physical necessaries of men may be supplied. There is a great division of the producing class, a class on which the welfare, the industry, the comfort, the whole national prosperity must ultimately rest. After this great division of the productive caste or class, whichever you like, there is the distributing class, the class that gathers in from the producers all that they produce in order to scatter it through the community, in order to make it accessible to every one; so that wherever man is, he may be able to reach that which is necessary for the support of the body, that he may have brought within his reach that which is produced afar-off but which he needs for his own maintenance: a vast distributing community, that is the second great national division. After the producing and distributing divisions, you have another great natural division, which is the guardian division of the nation. It includes the soldiers and the sailors that preserve the people from foreign attack. It includes all who administer the law, the police who act as the guardians of internal order, the barristers, the judges, the rulers, the kings, the great class that organises the nation and under whose protection the functions of the producer and of the distributor are carried on in peace and in safety, without foreign aggression and without domestic turmoil. These are the inevitable and natural divisions. If the man who produces is also to distribute, then his

production will be badly done; for, while he is carrying about his goods to sell them, his fields will remain untilled, his cattle will remain untended, and all the work in which he ought to be engaged will be neglected, while he is looking after the distribution that ought to be done by somebody else. And if there is no organising and defending class, then the producer and the distributor will alike both have to be half warriors, half policemen, doing everything badly and doing nothing well. And the sign of a civilised community is that these functions are distinguished, that different men take up different functions, and each is carried on for the welfare of the whole. When you have these great divisions of producer, of distributor, of defender and ruler, there is still one department of human activity that remains unfilled, vital for the progress of the nation, vital for the growth of the people: and that is the function of the teacher, teacher of Science, teacher of Philosophy, teacher of Religion. Unless there be a teaching class, the whole nation lacks one element in its growth, and you have rather a community of animals without minds than of men whose minds are the highest part of their nature, and need training, and education, and development, and guidance, that men may be men and not brutes, that the Soul may live as well as the body if maintained and fed.

Such are the four great natural divisions. These functions are needed in every nation. These functions must be discharged in every society. The question is not: "Shall there be the functions?" but: "Shall they be organised on a definite plan?" so that a nation shall be orderly and not anarchical, shall be contented and not continually at struggle and at strife. For just as in the human body you must have different organs in order that life may

go on, as you need the brain to think, as you need the lungs to breathe, as you need the stomach to digest, as you need the hands and the feet to walk, and as the human body would be helpless and constantly in turmoil if the feet and the hands demanded to act as the brain, and if the brain were occasionally used as a method of locomotion, and sometimes the stomach thought that it would do the breathing, and occasionally the lungs took up the function of digestion; so it is that in every civilised and ordered society these functions should be discharged by definite organs, so that you may get rid of strife and struggle and turmoil, and have a society which is a living organism and not a heap of unrelated fragments, continually at strife and coveting each the work of another fragment which it does not discharge.

The next thing to realise, in order that we may at our leisure think out the subject more fully than in a lecture I can deal with it, is that Humanity is a Brotherhood as the human body is a brotherhood. But brotherhood does not mean identity, and brotherhood does not imply a flat, dead level of absolute similarity and so-called equality. That is where the blunder so much comes in, and the confusion of thought. The wise are not equal to the ignorant. The ignorant are not equal to the wise. Those who belong, say to some undeveloped type of man, like the Veddahs of Ceylon, are not equal to the highly developed races that you find in this land, that you find in the West as the leaders of civilisation. There is a difference between the different members of the human family, as there is a difference between the baby in the cradle, the father in the world, and the grandfather, wise with the experience of long years in life, and therefore the adviser and the helper of

the younger. A family does not mean that the baby takes on himself the function of advising, and that the grandfather goes and lies down in the baby's cradle and is told what he ought to do. Brotherhood means that every one holds his power for the common good, uses his faculties for the common service. If he is strong, he is strong not to injure and bully the younger members of the family, but to defend them, guard them and so to serve the whole. It is the duty of the elder brother to take care that the weaker is not injured, that the weaker is guarded, that if the weaker wants, the wants of the weaker shall be taken care of before the wants of the stronger; and the father and the mother and the elders would rather starve themselves to feed the little ones than let the little ones starve while the elders have plenty; for brotherhood means common union for the common good, and the greater the strength the greater the duty, the greater the power the greater the responsibility to discharge. There is only one other preliminary point before we have the materials for our study, and that is reincarnation. If men's lives were but the one that is between one cradle and one grave; if men's lives were bounded by the womb of one mother at the one end and by one funeral pile at the other; if all men's lives were within these two limits, and one came into the world a new-born soul, and passed out of the world never again to return to it, then this human life would become unintelligible, and no social order, with justice as its basis, could exist. But men have many experiences in many lives, many births under many circumstances, and you might as well say in dealing with one life that it is unjust to send a child to school, and then later let it pass from the school to the college, and not at once take it from the cradle to the Senate House, as say that it is unjust for the undeveloped Soul to be trained, guarded

and taught by the more highly developed; for the child-Souls are not ready for the harder work of the world, and the very fact that reincarnation is a reality is a clue to social order, and to the building of a real social State.

Coming now to the question first of Caste, I am going to take Caste in the past in the East, Class in the past in the West; then Caste in the present in the East and Class in the present in the West. You see the line of thought along which I am going to lead you. First I shall take Caste and Class in the past, so that we may see what they were meant for, and then I shall take Caste and Class in the present, so that we may judge if they are doing their duty and are carrying out the objects for which they were designed. And I shall probably say things to you that will raise in your minds objection, both on the one side and on the other. In dealing with the ancient Caste-system, of which I am a supporter, I shall jar on the feelings of some amongst you who look only at the outer surface of the moment, and do not realise the principle underneath; and in speaking of Caste in the present I shall be likely to jar on the feelings of some amongst you, who because they know the right principle, close their eyes to many of the mistakes that in the present are connected with it. Reform is needed, but reform on the ancient lines; changes are wanted for adaptation to new circumstances; but changes well considered, and not simply careless striking at everything, and not defending a thing merely because it is attacked. Now as to Caste in the past, I spoke so fully last year that I will only very shortly say now as much as is necessary for my subject. What is the theory underlying Caste in the India of old ages, which is the eternal justification of the system in the eyes of thinking and religious men? First of all, Soul reincarnates, and

when it comes into experience of human life it comes without knowledge, it comes without experience, and it comes without training; at first the burdens on it must be very light and the demands made upon it must be exceedingly small in their force and in their compelling power. Therefore in the ancient system the foundation idea of the lowest caste of the four orders—the Shudra caste—was the idea of Souls not yet trained, not yet experienced, coming into the world to learn the lessons in school as it were, and therefore with the duties a child has, of obedience, of subordination, of service, and of training, and these lessons are as the lessons in a school, that the child-Soul may be taught and gather the experience needed for later life. And just as when you took a Brahman boy and sent him to a Guru, he had to perform services for the Guru, lighting his fire, tending his cattle, as part of his training, so in the great life of the nation, and the long life of the individual Souls, this was the first class, the beginning of the training, the first lowest grade in the school, where little was asked for: hardly any restriction on food, they might almost take what they liked; there was no restriction on travel, they might go wherever they liked. The training must not be too hard for the young Soul, and put on it all the restrictions and difficulties that, when it was strong, it would be ready to endure. And so the life was a free life. They might do wellnigh anything in the way of occupation. They might eat, drink and travel almost as they would. The restrictions were very light, and the difficulties were very small. It was, as it were, an infant in a school, where you do not make discipline too severe, for the young ones are not yet habituated to restraint and control.

When in many lives a Soul had been thus trained, when in many lives it had gathered these early lessons, it passed on to the next caste in its birth, and was born in the caste of Vaishyas. There it had a heavier duty laid on it, and greater restrictions. For a Vaishya was a twice-born man, and on him came the heavy responsibility of wealth, hand in hand with severer restrictions put upon him. Do not forget that in the old days it was the duty of the Vaishya to hear and study the Vedas. He wore the threefold thread, as a sign of belonging to a twice-born Caste. In this birth the Vaishya was to keep the stores of wealth for the nation, wealth not for himself but for the whole community; he was to gather wealth, to be a faithful steward in the national household, so that learning might be supported, so that the nation might be wealthy, and so that everywhere there might be an organisation of labour, plenty of agricultural supervision, plenty of commerce, plenty of trade, and plenty of everything that was necessary for that material side of the national life. On him was the duty of maintaining the temples, of feeding the starving, of upholding the learned, of building choultries for travellers, of opening places of rest and food for pilgrims, so that there might be no starvation, no misery, no wretchedness in the well-ordered household of the Aryan Mother. That was the Vaishya's duty, a duty that needs badly to be discharged to-day in modern India.

After many lives of that, the Soul was born in the third division, that of ordering the nation, of defending it, of guarding it, of helping it, of keeping peace within, and of protecting it against invasion from without Heavy was the demand on the Kshattriya in old days. Life was dear to him as to others, wife and children loved by him as by others, but to him

came the voice of Dharma: "You hold your life for the national service, for the national welfare. If there is danger, it must not strike the Shudra, it must not strike the Vaishya, it must not strike the Brahman. Go out for their defence, and give your life as sacrifice for the people who look to you as rulers and protectors." Because the Soul was growing stronger it was ready for the sacrifice, and because the Soul was growing stronger it was ready for the service; the clinging to life which marks the ordinary man must have no place in the heart of the Kshattriya, for he lived for the nation's welfare, and so poured out his blood like water rather than that the people should be struck.

Then there came the fourth division, that of the teacher, that which we know as the Brahmana; hedged about with hard restrictions, cut away from the enjoyment of life; bidden to have no worldly wealth, for wealth belonged to the Vaishya; bidden to have no right to struggle for liberty, for that belonged to the Kshattriya; bidden not to eat and drink and travel about as he liked, for those were the privileges of the Shudra; but he had the hard life of self-denial, which cut him off from the enjoyment and luxuries of life, and marked him to be kept pure in his magnetism, guarding his magnetism for the welfare of the people, not for selfish pride and conceit, not for personal arrogance or for personal domination, but in order that the Gods might have a mouth to speak through to the people, and that the lips of the Brahmana might be the lips that should teach the law.

Such was the basis of the Caste system. Such was the idea of the ancient order. I shall show you, when I have dealt with Class in the West, how confusion has arisen, and how out of confusion discontent and

the sense of injustice, which you find in many a heart to-day.

In Class in the West, looking at the past, there was a similar order. They had there the king and the nobles by hereditary right—by birthright—and the ruling class, which here would be the caste of Kshattriyas, was the class of men who were the fighters and judges and rulers, whose sons succeeded their fathers, and ruled, fought and made laws by hereditary right. These were the great nobles of England in the past: the king first, then the dukes and the barons and the earls, and so on. All these men were of a hereditary class, just the same as the caste, and exactly the same in its idea: a class of men marked out by birth for particular duties, which were the defensive, the ruling, and the organising duties, that we have seen as one natural division from which no nation may escape. Then there was the class, the great Middle Class as it was called, that dealt with commerce, with trade, with the supervision of agriculture and so on, the mighty class that you read about in English History, that grew up slowly under the shadow of the warlike nobility, and massing themselves in the towns of England gradually formed "guilds," as they were called, for all purposes of trade, close bodies for each trade. And then below them, the mass of the cultivating and producing people, tied to the soil, with duties of what were called "feudal tenure," bound to discharge these duties in exchange for protection, ever bound so strictly to the soil that even to-day in England if a man is starving, the first question that is asked is: "What parish does he belong to?" That means: "Where was he born?" "Which is the place that is responsible for his maintenance?" If a man who was born in the North of England comes down London,

and is found starving there, even now they send him back to the place where he was born and which is responsible for his maintenance, for his birth marks the place whence his maintenance should come. That comes down from the old days, the Law of Settlement, as it is called. But there is this difference in the fourth caste—the teaching caste. In England the Church was in alliance with the State, the Church was coextensive with the State; the Church made arrangement with the State, as being the religious side of the people. The difference between the East and the West has been this in religious matters: that in the East religion permeates every part of human life, whereas in the West it has always been more outside the common or "profane" life; so that it makes a compact, as it were, with the outer life, and you have the Church and the State in strict alliance, instead of religion permeating all, and the whole basis being built on the fabric of a national faith.

Mind you, in the old days these classes were real. To-day they are shams. There was no duke that did not lead; there was no baron that did not take his men into the battle-field, when there was foreign or domestic war. They discharged the duties of their order. And so with the other classes. Therefore there was national prosperity. There was national wealth. And though life was in many ways rough, yet it was a life that in architecture gave the grandest buildings, that in literature, ere it wholly disappeared, gave the mightiest writers, and where the masses of the people also had plenty of food, plenty of clothing and of shelter. There was no such starvation known in England then as England knows to-day, in the later disorder that has come upon her people. England was called "Merry England"; who would call her so to-day?

I come to the present. Now let me take in the present first the Class—the order is the reverse of what I have taken in the case of the past. In England we have still the Classes. We have our Royal family. We have our noble families, and nobility goes by right of birth and nothing else. They rule by right of birth. They make laws by right of birth. They take titles by right of birth. The eldest son of a duke becomes duke when his father dies; the eldest son of an earl becomes earl when his father dies, and the moment that he gets his title, if of age, he goes into the House of Lords and makes laws for the people. The whole of the Empire is ruled by that House, in conjunction with the Crown and with the Commons, and it is filled not by knowledge, not by wisdom, not by age, not by capacity, but entirely by right of birth, no matter what the character or the qualifications of the man may be. Nowadays that class is a sham, a sham because it does not do the duty which in the old days was joined to the name. It is a sham, because the duke, whose title means leader, does not think of going out to the battle-field when there is danger, but asks other people to go and fight for him while he remains quite safely at home, and so also with the rest of our "great nobility". The names do not carry with them work, and therefore there is discontent, and therefore there is complaint, and there is agitation, and a cry is going through the land: "Abolish the House of Lords." Why? Because it is a sham and it is a farce; because the men who take the name of leaders do not lead, and because instead of duty they take privilege, and use their rank for personal ends instead of for public service. But there is another way to-day of getting rank, and that is gold. If you have plenty of money, lakhs upon lakhs of money, if you are so rich that when people look at

you they do not see you and your mental qualities, but only a big gold veil that dazzles them, so that they cannot see through it and understand what lies behind; you may be very ignorant, you may be very foolish, you may know nothing about politics, you may never have done anything for the national welfare, but if at the bank you have got a big balance, and have done some party services, then you are a golden idol, and every one will bow down and do you homage, and then you can get a title. It is a great thing to have a title for which you have done nothing. It is grand to call yourself a lord, not by your inner worth but by gold. If a man has got plenty of money he pays so much in contested elections, and thus serves the Government of the day by getting men they want into the House of Commons. He buys votes practically, although a deliberate purchase of votes is illegal. Then you are a patriot, and not in any fashion dishonest or immoral, and when you have done this many a time, and when you have time after time wasted thousands upon thousands of pounds in this way, then you deserve well of your party, that man has done great service to Government, and therefore must be made a hereditary legislator, and must be rewarded for spending his money by being given the right to make laws for the Empire and to sit in the Council of the Nobles. In America and in Australia they have not even this little covering of "honour" to hide the nakedness of money worship. Money is the one title to social honour and to social power, and you may have a man, as they had in America lately, a man who counted his money by millions upon millions of dollars, and who had gained his money by spreading reports about railways and making them valueless—wrecking as they call it—and then buying up the property after it had become nearly worthless in the market, and then running it

up again when he got it into his hands, and getting large sums for that for which he had given very little. You hear of the Stock Exchange and of gambling on it. The great secret is this: "Get news before your neighbours. Do not tell them the news that you have. If that news makes any stock you possess worthless, sell it to your neighbour before the news becomes public, before he knows that it is worthless, and then his pocket will be emptied while yours will remain full." When you have done that for a long time you become rich, and then everybody looks up to you as a successful man in the Western world, and you are held up as a model to your race. You know I was on the School Board of London. I used to see books given to children as prizes. There would be stories of what are called "self-made men," and these men were those who started with sixpence in their pockets, and came as little boys with sixpence to some town, and then they were very industrious, and very thrifty, and very careful, and not always too particular about matters of conscience, until at last they got richer and richer, and had a million of money at the bank, and built one or two churches, and a statue was put up to them in the market-place when they died; then they are held up to children as models of successful men, men who made money too often by the unmaking of their fellow men. What is the result? The result is discontent, struggle, masses of the working population discontented and threatening revolution—masses of the working population saying: "Why should these men, who are by no means more moral then we, no more learned than we, no wiser than we, why should they be so wealthy while we are so miserable and poor?" Men do not really think much in their hearts of money, however much they may bow down to it and do it social homage; no man thinks himself really below another, merely because

the other is richer than he; and where wealth is the title to honour, there is struggle, discontent and threat, for wisdom may be honoured without jealousy, but the honouring of wealth means social strife, and ever-growing discontent among great masses of the people.

I come to the East, the East of to-day. Take the Caste system as you find it here to-day. How have the changes come about? It is clear, and we all know it, however devoted our belief in the Hindu faith may be, that the four castes of the old time are not really amongst us to-day. If we test them by the test of the Shastras, if we test them by the test of the Lawgiver, we shall find that they are shams to a very large extent, as much a sham and a farce in the East as the titles of the nobility are a sham and a farce in the West. How has that come about? It has come about by the Caste forgetting its Dharma, its nature and its duty. By a slow change in hundreds and thousands of years, the duties of the Caste have been forgotten. The Brahmana has sought for power and wealth. The Kshattriya has sought to do the teaching work of the Brahmana. The Vaishya has forgotten his duty, and has wanted to take up the work of the Kshattriya, and the Shudra has claimed to take the duties of the twice-born. No caste is content to do its own duty, but every one claims to do the duties of everybody else. For hundreds and thousands of years this has been going on, and I say to you, my brothers —and I have the right to speak to you plainly face to face, for I defend you in the West and there speak in defence of you where I find you attacked—I have a right to say to you face to face that the beginning of this degradation lies on the caste that ought to be the noblest, that ought to be the highest, that ought to be the purest, and the degradation began

when first the Brahmana coveted wealth, and desired physical authority; when he took the wealth that belonged to the Vaishya, the rule that belonged to the Kshattriya, and was dissatisfied with his spiritual knowledge, and was discontented with his spiritual authority. For just as a man might turn aside from his wife and take another woman to his home, so has the Brahmana deserted the bride of spiritual knowledge which was his, and has taken to wife the wealth and the jewels and the glories of earth; and because of that spiritual adultery, a confusion of castes has arisen, and with confusion what Arjuna prophesied—degradation of the nation and the gradual lowering of the whole of the national life. Side by side with that spiritual degradation, there is the maintenance of an outer rigidity, which gives privilege without discharge of duty. Why should the Brahmana claim his right as a Brahmana, merely because he has been strict in his outer observances, and take the privileges given him in the days when he was the teacher of the people, when he neglects the teaching and has lost the knowledge? The outer form without the inner reality has worked evil; it has led to conceit, arrogance and the inclination to look down on those who are not Brahmanas, so that there is bitterness in the hearts of the people; a failure in Brahmana duty while clinging to Brahmana privilege has made jealousy, anger, discontent and disharmony, where otherwise there might have been, and should have been, peace, love and progress that is orderly. For, mind you, when confusion arises, when the Brahmana deserts spiritual wisdom for the strife of parties, when he deserts spiritual wisdom for a contest for wealth, the Dharma of the Brahmana is broken, and reincarnation largely fails of its effect; for the Brahmana is the Soul, not only the body; the Brahmana is in the life not only in the

birth; and if the duties are not fulfilled, what shall the Brahmana Soul do, when it is coming back, and seeking reincarnation in a family where it shall find the Brahmana conditions, in order to grow and develop and become a model of spiritual life to men? Suppose a Brahmana Soul—I mean a highly developed, a spiritual Soul—is seeking incarnation, and comes to India and searches for a Brahmana's family, and finds the Brahmanas ignorant of Sanskrit, of the Vedas and of the real meaning of the Shastras, and finds with them the outer appearance and not the inner reality; and suppose that it finds the inner reality in some other caste or even in some other race? Suppose in a Shudra family it finds men and women who are pious, religious, who are careful to do their duty well, and who lead noble, pure and useful lives; it may well be that the Brahmana Soul takes on the outer degradation of the body, preferring the degradation of the physical to the degradation of the spiritual. For what is a real Brahmana? A Brahmana Soul or Brahmana body? One without the other? There is where the difficulty comes in. No man is fully a Brahmana unless the Brahmana Soul has a Brahmana body, and unless the Brahmana body has in it the Brahmana Soul. Do you think that I am saying what I cannot bring proof of? What said the great Lawgiver when he was dealing with the Brahmana caste? He told you that sacred learning came and gave herself to the Brahmana, his treasure to be guarded from pollution and disgrace; and then Manu, the great teacher, goes on and says: "As an elephant of wood, as an antelope of leather, so is a Brahmana that is without learning." All three have only an empty name, *viz.*, an elephant of wood, an antelope of leather and a Brahmana without learning—spiritual learning. He must know the Vedas so that he can teach them, understand them so that he can instruct. A Brahmana by birth who cannot

do the Brahmana duty is like the wooden elephant and like the leather antelope, very pretty to look at but utterly useless for all purposes of life. Suppose you get a Shudra Soul in a Brahmana body. How shall we recognise it? We shall know it by the marks that appear. We shall know it by its low desires and petty ambitions. We shall see a Vaishya Soul in a Brahmana body when the supposed Brahmana wants plenty of gold, when he wants to become wealthy, when he wants big houses and costly furniture. He may wear his thread as much as he will, but the Vaishya Soul is there. By the Law he is no Brahmana, and has no place in the Brahmana caste. So if you find in the body of a Shudra a soul that is pure, true and noble, but lacking in patience, I say to you that it is no wonder if that Shudra, cut off from the privileges of the Brahmana but knowing his own life purer than the lives of many Brahmanas around him, says: "This Caste is a folly, this Caste is an absurdity, this Caste is a thing to get rid of. It is not justified by the life, and injustice is done to me. I will do my best and tear it down to get rid of the farce."

I believe in the reality of Brahmanahood. I who know that there is a Brahmana caste in reality, which is a living and working power in human life to-day, tell you that just because I honour the real Brahmana, do I look with sorrow and shame on many a nominal Brahmana that I see around me; for, so says the Law, those that cannot teach are not Brahmanas. The child that knows is older than the grey-headed man that knows not, and if I meet a grey-headed Brahmana and find that he is ignorant of sacred learning, and can teach me far less than I already know, do you wonder if I say that if India is to be helped, this farce must be turned into a reality, and some few at least must lead the Brahmana life, in

order to make it possible that the caste may be kept alive for happier times, to serve as the vessels into which spiritual life may hereafter be poured ?

There is one other point about Caste. In the old days, it was not rigid as it is rigid now. In the old days a man could pass from one caste to another, if he showed the qualities of the higher. If a Brahmana was born as a Shudra from a piece of bad karma, if he worked through it and showed the Brahmana quality, then he was passed on to the Brahmana order, which was a reality and not merely a question of the body and of the form ; so that in the Scriptures you find cases even of the outcaste, of men who had no known father and no kind of family to which they could appeal ; you find the great Teachers of the past taking such a boy, if he showed the Brahmana qualities, and judging, not by the outer body, but by the inner Soul, and then passing the body through the necessary ceremonies that gave the magnetic purity and the physical conditions. Then there was no discontent, no feeling of injustice, and no feeling of being kept in a place which was below that to which the Soul had a claim. Always there was the open door, and the Soul could pass through it, carrying with it the garment of the body, thus making the body subservient to the real life. But mind you, in these questions of food and other things, there is a real natural truth. The magnetism of food is important. That which you take into your body helps to make the instrument in which your Soul has to work, and there are different qualities of food suited to the different functions that men have to discharge in life. All these questions of eating or not-eating together are questions of real importance based on reality. Only, in this modern community, they are often based on shams instead of

on reality, for magnetic purity is a question largely of the Soul, and no man is pure magnetically who speaks untruth, or loves untruth, or does evil in his daily life. I would rather take food with a man who in his body belongs to a low caste but in his mind is pure, than I would sit down and take food from the hands of one who is nominally pure and whom I know to be stained with ambition, and to be soiled with lack of truth and honour in daily life. All this has to be considered. You see the line of thought; namely, not to abolish, but to make real; not to get rid of, but to reform; so that, as in the old days, there may be bodies fitted for the incarnation of the higher Souls, parents leading the life of Brahmanas, not only in the food and the outer observances of the caste.

Thus I speak, for I hope—having come to make my home in this holy land—to try to show you, as time goes on, to whom I belong by faith and by duty, the lines of practical reform which are needed if our India is to be saved. Discuss the thought amongst yourselves. I have placed before you mere outlines and principles, but I hope, in concert with some of your most religious and pious men, to take counsel and to mark out ways which will make this thing a reality, and give it that spiritual life for the lack of which we are falling, and for the lack of which the world itself is crying out. I know the old countries. I have lived there. I know how they are suffering, and the causes that have led them to their present state. I know the misery, the poverty, and the degradation. I know the wretchedness and the struggle. I went there to learn it and I have learned lesson by lesson. For what? I went there and was born there to learn—in order that, by experience gathered by my brain that I am using now, I might learn what civilisation might teach. I learnt what

misery and struggle are in Western lands, that I might gather together the knowledge I could in a form available for use, and then come back to my own race and people, and give them a warning that, alas! they would not listen to, if it did not come through a tongue and from a brain trained in the midst of a civilisation that it denounces and in the midst of the miseries that it knows. For they cannot blind me with the glitter of their civilisation, and they cannot dazzle my eyes with the glory of their outer appearance. I have been underneath, to the slums and misery; I know its folly; I have lived in it. I know its wealth. I know its luxury, and everything for which you are yearning and which is dazzling the younger amongst you to-day. I come back to you and say that this thing is a sham, and that it is a delusion, it means degradation and not rising; it means spiritual death and not life. Let us take a warning by these lessons; let us learn from their experience to avoid their blunders, and let us join hand in hand, not men of one caste but men of all the four orders which were once appointed. Then let learned men come together to take common counsel for the common good, and little by little, step by step, bring back the spirit into Indian life and into Indian religion, giving honour where it is due, honouring the Brahmana if he be pure and communicates his spiritual wisdom and is able to teach; honouring Caste not in its name only, but in its reality, not the outer show but the inner life. Thus, in the centuries that lie in front of us, shall be undone the evil work that has been done, and the nation shall be raised as a whole. That is the work that lies before us. That is the work in which I ask you to take me as your helper; for the life which came from India is given back to India for service, and I sacrifice it to the helping of our race.

THE NEED FOR IDEALS[1]

THE subject for our talk this evening is really a very practical one, although the word "Ideals" is the chief word in the title. If you look round on the world, as you see it now, there is one very widespread and definite characteristic of men as they grow older and more experienced. When they begin life as young men, they are full of enthusiasm, full of readiness to sacrifice themselves, full of eagerness to serve the country; but if you notice them year after year you will see that the enthusiasm is rather apt to cool down, that the readiness to sacrifice becomes less, that the practical service to the country seems to exercise over them less attraction, until by the time they have reached about middle life—about 45 or 50 years of age—you find that the enthusiasm has disappeared. They are apt to become somewhat cynical, somewhat pessimistic, even despairing. The warmth has gone. They become chilly and indifferent. It is not surprising that in the course of public life these changes should gradually come over the minds of those who begin by being workers for the country. In no career is it more marked perhaps than in that of a worker in public life, and in no career is it more disappointing, with difficulties, with the failure of friends, and with the bitter opposition of enemies. That is the universal experience. I am not speaking of Indian public life only, but of public life in all

[1] A lecture to young men at the Pachaiyappa's College.

countries such as we have at the present day. When success seems unattainable, the more unselfish their aims the more apt are they to become weary and disheartened. They find people often ridiculing things which they themselves most admire, and so a sense of discouragement creeps over them. To find a middle-aged man full of optimism is the rarest of all things.

While I say that this is characteristic of public life everywhere, it is true that you find it perhaps more in India than in other lands. That is chiefly because public life in India is at the present time such terribly up-hill work, and because as more and more people strive for the country they find opposition accumulating against them. There are so few that withstand opposition and so many who fall back, and at last public life seems to take on the characteristics of a forlorn hope. A public worker does not expect to win; he expects only to fail; and when a man has taken up that position—and I admit that there are many admirable Indians who do—unless he has an ideal to which he can hold, he gradually becomes a cynic rather than an optimist. One notices it so very much that I feel here especially the need for ideals, for although they are necessary everywhere for a really noble life, they are essential to permanent activity for the country here, where realisation of objects is difficult to attain.

I want, then, to put before you that real devotion to an ideal is a necessity for the publi[illegible] Indian at the present time. Unless he [illegible]ion, he will gradually weary of h[illegible]ill find that as years go on h[illegible]s expecting [illegible] fa[illegible] instead of hoping to succeed. Every [illegible] effectively must endeavo[illegible] to [illegible] to b[illegible] about the object which [illegible] aiming [illegible] achie[illegible]

While it is true that the great lesson of the *Gita* is that man should learn to work without desire for fruit, that becomes possible and useful only when man has reached a higher motive—the determination to work with the Divine Will for the progress of the world. Absence of desire for fruit tends to indifference until a man is truly intent upon the welfare of the world. When he has reached the point when the welfare of the world for him is the one thing that is desirable, when he realises that the Divine Will is the bringing about of that welfare, then he will lose nothing of his activity when his desire for fruit has passed away. Comparatively few, however, in ordinary public life can really maintain activity, strength and vigour, unless they have an ideal before them which they are endeavouring to achieve. Only those can persevere against continual disappointment whose ideal is clear and whose devotion to that ideal is complete. Let me take for a moment as an example a man whose name is dear to all of you—Gopala Krishna Gokhale. There you have a man who placed before himself a quite definite ideal, namely, the lifting up of his country to a place among the foremost Nations of the world. If you read his speeches, as all patriots should, you will note almost with surprise now and again the strength and vigour of his hope and of his determination. He did not expect to be successful himself. You remember his famous phrase that some of us must "serve India by our failures," and he found that to be the almost unbroken experience of his own life. But, despite the fact that he knew he would continually fail, the ideal maintained him where the actual was hopelessly disappointing, and so you find him year after year with unchecked and undiminished vigour, as strong, as vigorous and as inspiring in his latest speech, as he was in his earlier days. There you have an example of a man who never

became a cynic, who never lost hope, who never became pessimistic, but always held before him a magnificent ideal. He found the value of an ideal in the moments of darkness which otherwise might have led to despair. I want, if I can, to put before you how ideals may be made, how we can aim at their realisation, and how there are two forms that an ideal may take. We may rightly take an ideal for each—the ideal character that we desire to embody, and the ideal of the Motherland that we desire to behold.

First of all, in order that things may be quite clear, let us answer the obvious question: What is an ideal? If you would begin with a conception of what we need, cut off the *l* in the word *ideal*. You have an idea, and that is the beginning of what an ideal means. It is an *idea*, a thought; but it is more than an idea. It is not one of the ideas that come and go, not one of the passing thoughts that come into the mind, but a thought that is there continually, that is always there, fixed and dominant. The next point in understanding what is an ideal is that it is a *fixed* idea, and it is a fixed idea *which guides and dominates conduct*. That is the full definition and meaning of an ideal: first the nature—thought; then its characteristic—fixity; then its work—the dominating of conduct, the building of character.

Some of you—the older amongst you—will have read the axioms of Patanjali; looking at the different kinds of men's minds, he classified them under four heads. He wanted to find what sort of mind was necessary for Yoga. Some, he said, had no steadiness, there was no firmness in them; they ran off after different thoughts as a butterfly goes from one blossom to another. Butterfly minds, he said, are not fit for Yoga. This is the mind of a child, under the domination of the senses, attracted by each object

of sense and constantly changing as new objects appear. Then he took the next class—the mind of a youth, and that he speaks of by rather a curious word which we shall have to translate as "bewildered" or "confused". In the time of youth, passion is strong. First one passion and then another changes the whole atmosphere of the mind; and so if you study the mind of a youth, you find its colour changes with the passing moods of passion and emotion rather than thought. Young men will turn away from a subject of thought to run after some powerful attraction through the senses, and such a mind is easily bewildered and confused by passion; that mind, says Patanjali, is not fit for Yoga. He comes to the mind possessed by a thought; the man is absorbed by one idea—love of power, desire for fame, desire for money, desire for pleasure or luxury. Whatever it may be, it dominates the man and all his conduct is guided by that dominant thought. It possesses him, it takes him and drives him in its own direction, and he is helpless in its grip. Such a dominant idea which possesses a man has two possible results: it may make him a madman, if the idea be false; and a madman cannot be made to listen to reason as he is possessed by a false idea. I do not suppose that many of you have been among lunatics, but if you spend some time amongst them, you will notice that one great characteristic of them is that they are possessed by one dominant idea, and that idea false. But where a man is wholly possessed by a true idea, then he becomes a martyr or a hero. Reasoning has no influence upon him; worldly advantage has no attraction for him. He is willing to die for his ideal. A martyr is willing to give away his life for an idea, and no reasoning can induce him to prefer life to that idea. Patanjali says that when such a man exists, he is near to Yoga; he reaches a position where the mind is completely

controlled by one single idea, and that means progress and strength.

Then you come to the last stage where a man is no longer dominated by an idea but chooses an idea; he willingly possesses—he is not possessed; he chooses, he is not seized. The man has all the strength of the idea under his control, and that man is fit for Yoga. It is that kind of definite, clear thought which is wanted for the building of an ideal, but very few people have their minds trained to that extent. There are methods which we can use to build up our ideal, and the first thing to do, especially for a young man or young woman, is to make up his or her mind what he or she wants to be, not to drift along like a rudderless vessel on the current of a stream, but to sit and say to himself: "When I have finished this part of my training as pupil in school and college I intend to be this or that," whatever it may be. A young man who chooses what he intends to be in life, deliberately chooses it with a strong and unswerving will, that man accomplishes that on which he has fixed his mind. Each one of you who are younger should be forming your ideal, and the first thing is to determine what you mean to be. Some of you have already an ideal: that you should be a great servant of your Country, that you should help to win her liberty, that you should like to devote yourself and all your powers to uplift your Country; that was the ideal that Mr. Gokhale had, and few nobler ideals can attract the mind of the young. The next step will be to think out: "Along what line of life shall I try to approach and ultimately realise my ideal? what profession shall I take up? what kind of work shall I do?" Let us suppose you have to win your livelihood. You will then choose a profession which will hinder you least

in becoming that which you are determined to become. You will choose that which seems to offer you the best opportunity of serving your country. Roughly that will very often mean the way of earning a livelihood in the least time that it requires to earn it, and so to give the rest of your time to public life. Not very long ago I had to put before a young man a choice as to what line he would take up when his college education was over, and I wrote to him, defining different lines. He was very clever, and would be able to choose his own way when his education was complete. I put before him the possibility of the Civil Service or the Law, showing how each was likely to work out in life. I pointed out to him that on the whole the best profession for a man who wanted to give his life to his country was the profession of law, for in that—if he did not want to live extravagantly—a simple living was easy to gain, and then he had a large amount of leisure that he might give to the service of his Country. I do not mean a very successful lawyer, for to become that he would have to give all his time to the profession; but a man who is content with a simple life can earn a living honourably in that profession, but at the same time give most of his time to the helping of his Motherland. My correspondent chose that particular line, for the reason that he could serve India better in that. Another advantage of law is that in a country where you are trying to gain reforms by constitutional means, a knowledge of law is necessary. There are numerous problems in the course of public life where an exact knowledge of your legal rights and powers is of inestimable advantage.

Supposing, then, you have chosen your object in life and your profession, the next step will be to

study. If you wish to be a statesman, you must study the lives of a number of leading statesmen, studying them from a psychological standpoint, and you will find what are the qualities which they had in common. Certain qualities are wanted in order that an ideal may be built up in the mind as an image. You will find these out by study, and if you want to be a successful statesman, you will select leading men and study their lives, and you will then find out what they had in common. There may be some qualities in which one statesman may differ from another; you disregard those differences. But there are some points that will be common: they will all be men of trained ability; they will all be men of knowledge of the world; they will all have a great amount of tact and understanding of human nature; and they will all have a felicity of speech and a firm grasp of complicated questions. Those are qualities of a statesman, and those would appear more or less in every great statesman. They may differ in everything else, in views, religion, temperament, etc. A young man who has chosen to serve his Country in political life would thus, analysing characters, choose the different qualities which make a great statesman and then build up those qualities in himself. He would put these all together, leaving out the separate things in which they differ; he would leave out everything which is not essential, and select the essentials of a statesman; that would be the ideal statesman to whose character he would try to conform himself.

If a young man wanted to be a soldier, he would similarly find out the qualities of a successful soldier, and produce those qualities in himself, shaping his character as that of an ideal soldier. He would do similarly with regard to anything which he desired to

be. He must study to make the ideal; he must build up the ideal bit by bit, by study, by imagination, by the creative powers of the mind; and when he has done that, then the attraction of the ideal must dominate him. He must feel devotion to this ideal that he has created, and it becomes for him the dominant thought of his mind, shaping his conduct and determining his character.

Let us suppose for a moment that you have taken the ideal of a public worker and that you have built up the characteristics that such a man should have—energy, unselfishness, willingness to sacrifice, power of grasping the needs of the moment, the understanding of human nature and the motives which play upon it. Supposing that you have made all these your ideals, then day by day you would think for a little time each day of the ideal which you have made, and you will begin to create in yourself those qualities one by one. Take, for instance, the quality of self-sacrifice, without which no great public work can be done. You can think of it in the morning and you can practise it all day long. You will remember it is written in the *Chhandogya-Upanishad* that man is created by thought, that what man thinks upon, that he becomes, and there lies the power of the ideal. You become the thing on which you think. If you have formulated your ideal and if you have definitely made up and placed before your mind the qualities which shape the ideal, then take those qualities one by one, thinking of one of them every morning, and practising it the whole day long whenever opportunity occurs; and then you will find that the quality you think upon gradually builds itself into your character and you begin to practise it unconsciously. That is the way in which great men grow: they develop in themselves by thought that which they determine to

become, and there is no human quality that you cannot create in yourself by steady and determined thought. But there is one snare which you have to avoid. You must never allow yourself to think about the opposite of the quality that you want to develop. Suppose, for instance, that you are trying to develop the instinct of self-sacrifice, you must never allow yourself to think of selfishness, because if the thought of selfishness is created it works against the other, and makes you selfish. I have met boys who happen to be by nature timid. I found a boy lamenting over it; he does not realise that by thinking of timidity he becomes timid more and more. Thought is a real power and not imaginary. If you think about any weak point, you become weaker and weaker by the thought that you give to it. You should always think about the noble side of yourself and not the lower side. You must think of yourself as perfect, as God unfolding in human form. But it is better to take up one quality after another, until the totality brings you nearer and nearer to God. It is written that Brahman is fearless, and so anyone in whom Brahman is living can become fearless by thinking of that quality. So realising in yourself that side of divine life, and so, step by step, taking quality by quality and thinking steadfastly on it, you build yourself into the shape of your ideal and embody the very characteristics that you admire.

It is here that devotion helps you enormously. If you can find some one who embodies that ideal, either completely as in Sri Krishna or Sri Ramachandra, or imperfectly as in some great man or teacher, then you will find it easier to develop it in yourself and grow towards that which you admire. You can think, for instance, more definitely and more clearly of a quality if you think of it as embodied in somebody.

That is why I have often said that hero-worship is one of the best things which any person can practise. The tendency in man is usually to find faults rather than virtues, to speak of the weak side of another rather than of the strong side. To depreciate another instead of appreciating good qualities is one of the most vulgarising of practices. The power to admire is a great power in the building of character, and admiration for a great quality tends to produce that quality in yourself. You would not love it unless you had a little of it already in yourself, and that will grow more and more if you admire it in its flowering in another. That is one value of great men: they embody ideals. They show us in concrete form that which is loved in abstract form, which to many of us is rather vague and indefinite. If you see courage embodied in Arjuna, if you see duty emdodied in Bhishma, if you see kingliness embodied in Sri Ramachandra, the vision exercises over you that moulding power in which devotion is one of the strongest possible influences. Love increases the force of thought, and more and more by dwelling on the greatness of the beloved we grow great ourselves. The spirit of scoffing, the spirit of cynicism, the spirit of depreciation—these are among the greatest weaknesses that you find in many at the present day. In the old ages there was far less of that. People do not realise how they are vulgarising the whole of their nature and dwarfing their strength, when they are constantly looking for weakness, and gossiping about deficiencies that they notice in one or another. It is said in an English proverb that no man is a hero to his valet. That is not the fault of the great man. It is the servant's mind that cannot realise the heroism before him. It is by the development of that side of human nature which this Sabha is intended to develop in its members, namely, devotion, that

boys grow into noble men and men grow into a maturity which is greater than that of their youth. There are some people who always keep young, fresh and active. They never grow old, and are never fossilised, as too many old people unfortunately are. A man who has an ideal never grows fossilised.

There is one form of ideal that is worth thinking of carefully just now, namely, the ideal of the country. You want that our country should become great. That is the ideal which rouses most devotion and patriotism. Devotion to the country is one of the most inspiring and constructive of forces. What do you want India to be? It is well sometimes to think on big lines, and not only that more posts should be thrown open in the Civil Service, and that a man should be able to rise to the highest place. What do you want your country to be in order that she may be ranked among the Nations of the world? Clearly one condition of progress, one condition of any evolution worthy of the name, one condition of greatness is—Freedom. Hence your first wish for the country should be that she should be free. One condition of freedom is that you should be free yourself, and you are not free as long as you are under the domination of the lower side of your nature. You cannot make your country free without making yourselves free; and no man is free who is not the master of his own mind and of his own body. No man can safely use outside freedom, until he has gained that inner freedom which we call self-control. Freedom becomes dangerous in the hands of a man who is not worthy of it.

Once in America, where all think themselves quite free, there was a cowboy galloping along a street, shooting in the air in a drunken freak, and one bullet struck a woman and killed her; he was let off

because he was drunk; it was a peculiar form of judgment. Now that man had a vote, and he had a right to make laws for his country. But men like that are dangerous to the country, and they are not worthy to be free.

The very first thing that all must work for in making India free, is to make themselves free from everything degrading, unmanly, untruthful and cowardly. You have to think out what it means to a Nation to be free. All the things that you have been asking for, for the last thirty years, could all be done by a Nation which was free without asking anybody, and you begin to realise that when you think of India as a free country, it means that she will be a Self-Governing country, a country making her own laws, a country shaping her own education, a country that will develop the whole of her resources for the benefit of her own citizens as well as for the benefit of the world. I want the Indian to be able to do in his own country everything that other people in free countries can do in theirs. That is the ideal which we should hold in our minds.

It may be that this love of freedom is a sentiment, but it is by noble sentiments that people grow, and it is by vulgar sentiments that they become debased. Any sentiment which makes you love your country and desire her liberty, that must be part of your National Ideal, and until then the Nation can never be great. You must train yourself in the methods of winning it. You must realise that the seeds of failure lie in the anger and hatred which divide man from man, and class from class.

There is no study which is really more instructive than the study of the French Revolution, which began in 1789, and then went on until Napoleon became

the Dictator of Imperial France. If you will read that story you will see how right and pure were the aspirations of the men who tried to lay the foundation of liberty in France. You will see, if you watch step by step, how violence took the place of reason, and force that of argument, and how all the earlier progress was gradually destroyed by the later parties which arose, more and more inspired by the spirit of hatred than the spirit of love. You have there one of the most valuable lessons. Violence begets greater violence. The French Revolution, though it began by thoughts of love and liberty, was wrested aside by misery, by starvation, and the result of all these was the violence that Revolution embodied, the murders, the terrible struggles, and the killing out of one political party after another, until in the end, the people, weary of violence, fell into slavery again under Napoleon. The story of the French Revolution is an instructive story for the young and enthusiastic. It began so well, but in the course of it violence was followed rather than reason. Misery and starvation cannot construct; they can only destroy. You must realise that to win freedom you need unity, self-control and strength; those are the qualities which make a Nation free. Get rid of divisions and antagonisms, and no longer make differences of religious thought divide in civic matters. You must learn the great lesson that thought must be free, before free action can come in. From liberty of thought comes difference of opinion, and you must realise that difference of opinion is healthy and not undesirable. You may be thinking better than I am thinking. Yet my own thought, though less good than yours, is better for me than yours, just as I shall grow stronger by eating my own food than by looking at you eating yours. Therefore it is that it is better to think, and even to think mistakenly, than not to think at all.

No truth is true which is not true to yourself. Truth becomes false when you do not really grasp it, and only repeat with your lips that which your mind does not comprehend and which your will does not accept. Think along your own line. Listen to everybody, consider the opinions of everybody, but do not echo them. Digest them all for yourself, and create your own opinion. Just as a chemist puts many ingredients into a crucible, and out of them produces a new substance which is different from each of them, so it should be with you and your thoughts. Take all the thoughts around you and put them into your crucible of mind, but produce a thought different from the thoughts which you have assimilated. It is independent thinkers who are really serviceable in the growth of a Nation. The one man who thinks is better than a thousand men who repeat the opinions of others like parrots.

So, in putting to you this need for ideals, in trying to show how you may choose and build ideals, and how by thinking and practising you may transform that ideal into your own life, and then how you may make your ideal for the country and work towards that, I am telling you how the building of an ideal affects the future greatness of a Nation. Freedom is the air that a Nation breathes.

But what qualities shall this Nation have? One quality inseparable from India is the quality of spirituality. That has ever been her greatness, and everything else has flowed from it. When India was spiritually great she was intellectually magnificent, she was emotionally full of beauty and dramatic art, and she was physically wealthy, so wealthy that she attracted all the Nations of the world to come and trade with the produce of this land. First spirituality, then intellectual power, then emotional art, and then

physical prosperity. If you want to bring back the whole of it, you have to develop those same qualities again. Religion is the foundation of National greatness. Religion is that by which a Nation becomes truly admirable in the face of the world. India, then, must be spiritual. Remember how Mr. Gokhale said that he wanted to spiritualise politics. Only as politics are spiritualised will the country become really worthy of the devotion of man. So, India has to be free, she has to be spiritual, she has to be great intellectually, she has to be great once more in art, she has to be prosperous on the physical plane. Worldly wealth and prosperity are found among those in whom you find art and religion. Prosperity is the result of National greatness. A Nation cannot be great without spirituality, without intellect, without art, but where those are found, there the wealth of the world flows into it, and as was once said of India—I admit from jealousy—gold found many ways into India but found no way to get out of it. There are endless ways now in which wealth leaves the country.

While I ask you to make ideals for yourself into which your character and your life shall be builded, I also ask you to make an ideal for the country, and to make that ideal for the country the idol of your worship and the aspiration of your life. If you do that, you can never grow cynical, disappointed and discouraged, for even in the moments of darkness the Star of the Motherland will shine in the sky above you, and when the clouds grow thick you will know that the Star is shining. For such a man, with such an ideal, there is no disappointment, there is no discouragement, there is no despair; for the greatness of India lies in the Councils of the Gods, and that which They have decided you can achieve.

ON THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS[1]

YOUR EXCELLENCY, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

It is my pleasant duty to-day to move that this meeting adopt the Report, which most of you probably have seen, containing the record of the year's work of the admirable Society which we are here assembled to support. It is not necessary, I am sure, that I should urge upon you the claims of a Society such as this. It is plain to the mind of every thoughtful and good-hearted man and woman that the animals around us, under our control and placed in our care, are lives for the training of which we are responsible, for the happiness of which we shall have to answer; and in this Report I have noticed with pleasure the practical kind of work which is sketched out for the instruction of its agents. None who has gone along the roads of India but must have seen from time to time cases of cruelty, thoughtless but remediable, which it is the duty of the community to prevent. I notice for instance in this Report one thing is mentioned, one which probably all of you have seen: the cruel hobbling which is used sometimes in the tying up of animals which are to be prevented from straying from the fields in which they are grazing, the hobbling especially of cattle that are driven along the roads. I do not of course deny, none of us can deny, that some form of restraint is necessary in order

[1] An address delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Madras S. P. C A., on March 16th, 1910, with the Governor of Madras in the Chair.

either to keep the animals within due bounds, or in some cases to prevent them from injuring passers-by on the roads. We know well enough here in India that the bull and the cow by the custom of thousands of years have been regarded as sacred animals, and the result of that is, for the most part, that they wander harmlessly and unfettered through the roads and through the streets. In Benares, where is my oldest Indian home, while walking through those narrow streets, we constantly have to push gently aside some bull that is let loose and that walks along the road taking grain at any shop he passes at his will, for none would deny to the Bull of Mahadeva that nourishment which his hunger craves; and a strange result is shown there in the feeling of the man to the bull and the bull to the man. A friend of mine was walking along waving carelessly a heavy stick, and a bull put down his head ready to charge. A shop-keeper called out: "Put down the stick, and the bull will not touch you." He at once dropped it and the bull walked quietly by. I mentioned this for a specific reason. The bull in Western lands is a dangerous animal and is always kept under restraint; but here he is allowed to wander freely at his will. Hence, when we see the creatures passing along the road with the head hobbled to the foot, so that every step of the animal is a difficult one, we may assume that generally the animal is dangerous and is thus hobbled for the sake of passers-by. But that is no reason why the hobbling should be cruel, and why every step should be made painful. The creature must be prevented from harming the human beings whom he passes without being practically tortured as he makes his way along the road.

There is one other point, not mentioned in the Report, to which I should like to draw the attention

of the officers of the Society. The donkey is an animal which is here very largely used for the carrying of burdens. There are two points with regard to that which it is the duty of every one of us to try to change. The first is the overloading, which is sometimes so extreme that if you walk behind the animal, generally very small in India, you will see those delicate legs bending under the weight of the burden that is being carried. The second thing is the way of loading. I do not know how far you observe these things, but my eyes have been long trained to observation. We need some clever person who will invent some way of loading the donkey which will not inflict constant pain; for if we look we see that the strap, which passes across behind to steady the load, is constantly cutting through the skin into the flesh. If you ask why this is done, you will be told: "Because the load does not balance." Then it is the duty of some inventive person, Indian or English, to invent some kind of saddle or pad which will secure the load on the animal's back without mutilating it, as it is practically mutilated at the present time. That is a point I venture to press on the attention of the Society.

Now I come to the more general question. I have said that there is no question among us that animals should be well treated; but there is one difficulty here which you do not find in the West, and it is the difficulty of two civilisations that look upon animal life in somewhat different ways. If you speak here to those who have been brought up in the ancient faith of India, they will tell you that there is only One Life, whether the life be in the man, or in the animal, or in the plant, or in the rock. There is only One Life that lives in each alike. That is one of the axioms of the Scriptures that here are held sacred by

the vast majority of the population. "There is nothing, moving or unmoving, that can exist" without the divine life which is its strength and stay. Out of that has grown up in the course of thousands of years that tender feeling between the man and the animal of which you see so much in India if you go outside the beaten ways. Cruelty is in large towns, where the meeting of two civilisations, thinking differently, clashing together, has very much confused and bewildered the minds especially of the ignorant and the poor. In the West and in the East animals are looked upon differently. The Englishman treats his animals exceptionally well—the favourite dog, the favourite cat, and the favourite horse. These are practically members of the Englishman's home. The children play with them—sometimes a little too roughly, and then they are always tenderly rebuked. But many an Indian may say: "Yes, that is all very well; but you eat animals. How can you tell us that you love them?" That is why I say that we need to try to understand each other. The nations of the West, like the Aryans when they came first to India, are as a rule meat-eating nations, but they are just as tender-hearted to the animals in touch with them as those of the East, who would think it a sin to slay an animal. That is very difficult for an Indian to realise. Some of my Indian brethren may say that I am making an excuse for my countrymen, but I pledge you my word that it is true. Habit and custom go a very long way. You do not realise the force of custom, and so sometimes my Indian brethren regard the Westerners as cruel from their point of view. Yet you will often find an Englishman sitting up all night by a sick horse or dog, nursing it as he would one of his own race, and trying to keep the life in it and to relieve it from pain.

Another point that may strike you is this—and it is in the Report. You will find that the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is asking there for a lethal chamber to be made for the painless killing of pariah dogs. There again you have different lines of thinking, and sometimes they cause great mistake and misjudgment. The Englishman will say: "The Indian is cruel; he will not put a suffering animal out of its pain." The Indian answers: "You are cruel. What right have you to take away the life that you are not able to give?" These are the differences between the two civilisations, and it is the duty of those who are living side by side to take the best of each and not to misjudge each other, because there are some differences in the ways of looking upon this question. I must point out that we can all unite on most points, we can all agree on most points, and if we agree on those points which are most vital, then by gentle persuasion and by argument we may perhaps find a common ground even where we do not agree. Take one point which is not unimportant, and here I especially address my English brothers. In these large towns you will very often find that the animals used for draught purposes are miserable skeletons of cattle or they are mere apologies for cattle or horses, drawing their loads painfully along the streets. You say: "How cruel to underfeed and drive these wretched animals!" But I say: "Yes, but look at the drivers also, and you will often find the ribs of the drivers as visible as those of the bullock or of the horse." That is a thing also that needs to be remembered.

Another point is that the carters are not always responsible for the overloading of the carts; and if the carters do not take these carts and keep the appointed time for the delivery of the load, they will be dismissed

or fined, or punished in some way; so they flog the helpless animals in order that they may not lose the bread for wife and child. I am not saying this in order to stop any action which would check the underfeeding or ill-using. I say this only in order that you may remember sometimes the pitiful condition of the human beings, and not be too hard on man while you are trying to help the animal.

I am very glad to see in this Report that the Society works for education more than for punishment. That is the right way. I do not deny that the law must punish, but education is always better than punishment. Much of the cruelty is thoughtless. I have seen a man thrash a bullock and then, a few minutes afterwards, go up to it, and pat it, and give it food out of his hand. You will never succeed in stopping cruelty in this country, or in any other land, until every member of the community realises his duty to the animals that serve the community. Understand that to stop cruelty it is not enough to give to the Society Rs. 50 and then feel your conscience clear. It is the daily duty of each of you, whenever you see an act of cruelty, to stop and remonstrate with the man who has done it, and try to persuade him rather than threaten him.

I have been given permission to-day to go outside the limits of my resolution, in order to tell you of a larger movement which is beginning in India by the devoted work of the Hon. Mrs. Charlton who is with us here to-day, and who has asked me to tell you—as she is not so trained to the platform as I am—that she has come here from England in order to try to found a Society, which will be incorporated on the 25th in Calcutta, called the Imperial League for the Protection of Animals. That League does not desire in any way to trench on any ground already occupied

by such a Society as that in the support of which we are met this afternoon. It desires to supplement, not to substitute; to assist, not in any way to take out of the hands that are doing it the work of a Society like this. You all know that the Society here is not intended to go outside the limits of the Presidency of Madras. Therefore, as other Societies are similarly limited, it is thought by some lovers of animals that it would be well to have some central body to extend throughout the whole of India, and I am not without hope that it will extend to every country in which the British flag is waving, and form for the whole of Britain and her dependencies one great band of those who love the animal world, to protect them from the infliction of any wrong that is remediable; and so it is proposed to form such an Imperial Society. Its object will be to strengthen everywhere Societies already existing, to be their helper and not their ruler; but where such Societies have not spread, where for any reason they have not been able to make their way, then the central body could move in any part of India, and perhaps form branches of this very Society in the Madras Presidency, and of others in other Presidencies. But its chief work, I am glad to note, will be persuasive and educational rather than punitive. You cannot go with punishment in one hand and argument in the other. You have to touch the heart with your appeal, and the brain with your reasoning; and if you are threatening, if you hold up the rod of the law, then the brain becomes bewildered and the heart terrified, then the argument and reasoning fail to move the culprit. Therefore, the great work of the League will be to unite together all agencies and supply any gaps in their working. The great endeavour of the new League will be to make every member of the community feel his duty. That

is the first thing to do. There is not one person in this hall who has it not as a religious and moral duty upon him to stop cruelty wherever he sees it. If you are determined it shall not be, cases of cruelty will no longer be found in this city. The fault is not so much with the ignorant, foolish people who strike the animals they are driving. The fault is with us, with you and with me, who see an animal tortured and pass by on the other side, leaving the animal to suffer unregarded and uncared for. The man who is cruel needs to be helped as well as the animal who suffers. It is far worse to inflict cruelty than to suffer it, and the man who tortures is an object of greater compassion even than the tortured animal. Indignation makes people forget that. But never yet was an evil cured by an evil. If you go in an angry mood yourself to rebuke an angry man, what does he say in his heart? "You are angry, and I am angry, and we use the same means to show the same feeling." But if you go up to him as a friend and brother, if you say to him: "My brother, that animal you are torturing has the same life as you and shares your own nature"; if you plead in this way instead of threatening, if you explain instead of menacing, then you have won a human heart as well as saved an animal, and the man will be tender in the future. Whereas if you attack him, he will strike the animal again when you are out of sight and he is no longer afraid. There lies our path. In a little Society we Theosophists have for the Protection of Animals, every member takes a pledge every morning that he will stop, or do his best to stop, any act of cruelty towards animals which he sees during the day. It is not necessary to enter a Society in order to make that promise to yourself, and to carry it out. But why should we do it? We should do it not only because there is but One Life, and because that Life

is wronged in every animal that is hurt. Not only because those who injure animals are injuring their Lord, but also because the whole level of a community depends on the human qualities that are developed in it; and compassion to the weak and the helpless is the quality that separates the man from the brute. And there is one thing it seems to me that you should remember. Where the strong and the weak are face to face, all the rights are on the side of the weak and the duties are on the side of the strong. People say: "We have rights over the animals. They are given to us for use." You have no rights over them. You have duties towards them; and your duty is to train and educate them, so that the animals in your hands may be better than the animals that have not had human help and training. People talk similarly of the rights of the parents over their children. The children have rights to education, to nurture, to tenderness and compassion. The parents have duties to the young placed in their hands to train and to educate. Give up this idle talk about rights over the helpless, over the weak, over those who cannot defend themselves. Their right is help; your duty is compassion. And you have no right to claim the high name of man unless to the weak and the helpless, whether it be the child or the animal, you are doing your duty to the fullest extent. You may say: "Should we not use them, drive them, ride them?" Yes, if you treat them well. I was told the other day: "The horse would rather be free, and yet you train it to draw your carriage or carry your saddle." I don't say it would not rather be free; but many people would rather have what is not best for them. Your children would rather play all day than go to school, but it is a bad father or a bad mother who lets the whim of the child overbear the child's good. The duty of the parent

is to train it into manhood or womanhood, and the animals who are your younger brothers and younger sisters, you have no right to be cruel towards, bu you have the duty to train them and to help forward their evolution.

If a man says that cruelty is necessary for training, my answer is: "Then you have not tried." Human beings can do anything with either children or animals with kindness. I have all my life loved horses, and have found them answer to gentleness. Once in India a horse was lent to me, and I noticed that his mouth was blood-flecked. The bit was cruelly spiked, and when I told the groom to put on an ordinary bit, he said the horse "was a bolter". None the less, I had the bit removed, and rode him with a snaffle, and a curb in case of need; I had to use the latter only once. After a few weeks, he became quite gentle and docile, and I rode him later over the rough Himalayan roadways without any danger to him or to myself. I have been accustomed to ride without whip or spur, finding hand, knee and voice all that are needed to urge or to restrain, to guide and control. It is not that a horse needs cruelty, but that the men who train it need the knowledge and the sympathy to manage the animals they are not worthy to own. Where a man is cruel, he has no right to ride or drive. Why, I have gone out, weak with fever, and my favourite mare, a high-couraged creature, full of play and mischief, has paced along like a rocking-chair, knowing I was not well; while another day she would bound, and jump, and play, enjoying the outing as much as I did. You can do anything with an animal if you are good to it, anything with an animal if you are kind. If you will not treat it as an infant soul put in your hand to care for, then you have no right to come into touch with this

younger generation who, in the future, will stand where you are standing, and whose evolution you are delaying by cruelty or harshness. With terror you can do nothing either with the child or with the animal; but with love you can do everything. But love means patience, and we are more apt to be irritable than patient.

One other point I will venture to put to you. Although probably you have agreed with me so far, you may not agree with me in this last. It is going outside the line of ordinary thinking. Every man has around him a certain protective coating that keeps him safe from the many lives around, which might be hostile to himself. He walks, as it were, angel-guarded as long as he breathes the life of love, the love that is divine and makes all creatures friendly. But if you do a cruel thing to an animal, or slay an animal, you attach that animal to yourself by the link of fear and hatred. The animal cannot by itself do much. One animal's feelings are not much in this great world. You have done more by that act of cruelty; you have broken through the covering which keeps you safe from the evils around you. You have opened the door by your cruel act, and through that open door all the animal suffering in the world can pierce you; the one becomes a channel through which the whole can pour into you and affect you for evil. You will not believe it; I do not suppose most of you will; but you will remember it, and sometimes you may think of it. And so I would ask you, friends, when leaving this Hall, to go out as messengers of mercy, as messengers of love. Let every one, man or woman, feel his or her own duty, feel his or her personal responsibility; if you will check every act of cruelty you see, explain the wickedness of it and the harm it carries with it, then

when you meet again in this Hall a year hence you may hope to do away with your S. P. C. A., for Madras will have become a city of love instead of one of much preventable suffering, and then you will feel that you are leading the higher life and are channels of mercy and not of suffering to the animal world.

THE PROTECTION OF CHILDREN[1]

YOUR EXCELLENCY AND FRIENDS,

It is my duty this afternoon to submit to you the Report of the Madras Society for the Protection of Children, and in making that submission, I shall ask you not to accept it as a mere formal Report, but rather that, when you lift your hands in acceptance, you shall pledge yourselves to the helping of the Society through the year that lies before us; for the mere formal acceptance of a report written by others, the acceptance of work wherein the labour of others is reported—these are worthless and idle if your own help is not extended to the helpless, and if outside the Hall you do not carry out in act that which, by the uplifting of your hands, you have pledged yourselves to do. I venture to submit first to His Excellency the Governor, and then to you, the citizens of Madras, that this Society is worthy of your helping, and does not receive from Madras the help for which it has the right to look.

It is sometimes said that the position of women in a country marks the level of civilisation to which the country has risen; but it seems to me that the position of the child even more marks the state of the community, and that where the children are not carefully nurtured and protected, there the nation

[1] A speech at the Annual Meeting of the Madras Society for the Protection of Children, held in February, 1913, presided over by the Governor of Madras.

cannot expect either the blessing of God or the respect of man. Now this Society, as you know, is intended to help the children of this vast Presidency. It is a Society incorporated according to law to prevent the public and private wrongs of children and the corruption of their morals. It is intended to take action for the enforcement of the laws for their protection, and, when desirable, to have those laws amended. It is further intended to help destitute children, and to bring those who are fatherless and motherless to others who can take the place of the parents they have lost. It would not be possible to find a Society with nobler objects, one which ought to obtain the support and the help of every good citizen in this Presidency. Looking back over these Reports, which have been sent to me from 1909 onwards, as I open each Report I see as the President of the Society the representative for the time of the Imperial Crown. The King is the father of every fatherless child, and the helpless and the suffering look to him for rescue and for compassion; and it is surely the high privilege of those who represent the Crown to take the place of guardian of the helpless children of the community, so that they may see in the person of the highest the one who represents to them protection, safety and succour. And when I turn from one Report to another, I find that the place of Sir Arthur Lawley, so loved amongst us, was filled at once when he left us by Lord Carmichael. The keen regret which we of this Presidency felt when almost in a moment he was swept away from us—that regret only ceased when you, Sir [turning to His Excellency], came among us, and we found that we could look to you for the help and the sympathy which we knew we were receiving from him So one after another in these Reports, the highest in our Presidency has been the Head of this Society for the Protection of Children.

You know how it is said, and said rightly—at least so I hold—that to the strong belong only Duties, to the weak alone belong Rights. Men and women have duties, children and animals have rights in every civilised community—the right to be protected, the right to be guarded, the right to be fed and clothed and shielded. If the tears of the little children, the groans of oppressed animals, if these ascend to God, they rot the foundation of a State and make hopeless the future of a nation. Well is it written in a great Scripture of the Hindus that it is the sorrow of the weak that undermines the thrones of Kings; and so we rejoice that here the throne stretches out his hands to guard the helpless, and that the children of our Empire shall not suffer so long as those who stand in high places come forward to see that right is done.

But while, friends, that is true, it is not all the truth. Every one of mature age should be a father and a mother to the fatherless and the motherless of the community. There stands the duty for many of you with regard to these Reports. And it is not wholly neglected. In looking over the list amongst those who have been rescued, I find that some of the wealthier of the community have taken little children to train and help them, out of the hands of our Society. I find cases recorded here in which an apparently hopeless case was taken away from miserable surroundings and given into the hands of a respectable Hindu family—a childless family—and became the child of the childless parents and is now growing up happily and well. Looking through the past Reports I find many cases of that kind, and in the one that I have the honour to submit to you, namely, this Report of 1912, there are there also some cases which, I think, should stir you into helping the movement for which I am here asked to plead. I find, for instance,

cases of girls—and this is a point I would specially submit to my Hindu brethren—I find cases here of young girls pledged in their girlhood, ere they knew the world, to the ruin of their womanhood in their maturity, and none to stretch a helping hand unless you come forward to protect them. For nearly twenty years in this land I have worked and lived in public life and in home life with the educated Indians of the land; and I know I am speaking for them when I say that this shameful traffic is no part of Hindu civilisation, and that Hindus are the first to desire that these little girls should be saved from the degradation that is implied in the word *Devadasis*—servants of God—prostituted to the vilest uses of human passion. It is those who belong to Hinduism who must take this shame away and sweep it from our Indian land.

One step can be taken perhaps here by the Society—to appeal to the Legislature to strengthen the law of the land upon this subject, to raise the age when a child may doom herself to shame, and at least let her grow to something like womanhood before she is condemned to a dishonourable future, whence there is no escape. There, then, is one thing that the coming year should do. Never again in a report of this Society should we have to lament that scandal which is a cancer in our midst. Oh, some of you have little girls whom you love, little girls who cling about your knees, little children whom you hope to see mothers in happy homes Is it not written that the wife is the Goddess of the household, the Light of the home? Every child who is here pledged to shame might be a happy mother, and might be the light of husband and children in some respected Hindu home. Do you say that your own daughters are safe? I tell you that every daughter born of Hindu parents is your child, and you are bound to save and to protect her; and so

I ask you to strengthen the Society in bringing about a change in the law, in strengthening the law, and making it possible that these shall be saved. Only law can do it. I know that Hindus are jealous—and rightly jealous—of legal interference with their religious faith; but does any Hindu dare to tell me that the prostitution of a child is a part of Hinduism, and that he would not welcome the strong hand of law when it takes a child from the hands of a woman who has a right to sell it to disgrace and shame? Do you want to see how women, who have grown old in that miserable and shameful trade, look back on the way in which their lives have been passed? Then turn to the Report and read how a temple woman who had amassed thirty thousand rupees as a fortune during the course of her unhappy life, dying, sent five thousand rupees to this Society to save other children from the fate which had been the curse and the misery of her own life. Could you have a better proof than such a legacy from one of the women themselves? Too late to save herself, she tried to save her little sisters, and sent to the Society which works against the whole of this abuse a poor five thousand rupees as not only a gift to its funds, but a protest against the wrong which had made her what she was. Apart from that point, I press it especially because legislation is proposed, and it lies with the citizens of the land whether that legislation shall pass. Remember that public opinion must speak strongly; because there are so many matters that laws have to deal with, and unless they are supported by the public voice they are likely to be put aside.

Leaving that, then, see what other work is done by the Society, worthy of your support. Boys and girls are sent out into the street to beg, not for their own

support—though that is sad and shameful enough—but in order to keep lazy elders, who out of the begging by the children make their miserable livelihood. You read in the Report of one crippled boy with limbs twisted more by the man who owned him, in order that out of the boy's agony a few more annas might be wrung from the charitable passer-by. That boy is saved by the Society. That boy is taken away from the man who tortured him, and placed on a couch where his sad life may be less sad for the few years that may be his. Take the other cases where little girls, sent out to beg, pass wellnigh inevitably into a life of shame. Take another case of a boy, said to be the terror of his neighbourhood, who was taken by the Society, put to school, gradually and gently disciplined and led aright, until the high spirits, which often make a boy naughty when there in no crime in the boy, found fit expression in making an honest livelihood. That boy has been saved from evil and placed on the path of good. Take another case of a girl said to be unsaveable, and one who could not be rescued. One of the members of the Society took her into his home, showed her some kindness, and she is now restored to the husband whom she had deserted, and happy home-life is again opening its doors before her. Why, if the Society during the past year had only saved one boy and one girl from evil, it would have justified its existence, and I only give you a few cases out of many; and if it does not do more, it is because you leave it without money and without help, and because one or two officers, however good, cannot do much; if the subscription is only about a thousand rupees or so, what is that for this Presidency? Because we starve the Society, its usefulness is limited and the children largely remain unsaved. It is your duty, the duty of each one of you. These children, when they are taken from the street, can only be

changed by education and by love. There is not one boy, however turbulent, in whom there is not the instinct of hero-worship which you should utilise for his salvation. If you take a so-called bad boy, shut him up in a house where he has no freedom, give him tasks and punish him when he fails, that boy will grow into a criminal and will be a curse to the community. Rather let some of the young among you—young, rich and idle—come forward and enrol yourselves as men who will look after these troublesome boys, who will play with them—and play better than they do—and so become heroes in their sight. Draw out the love of the boy; there is no boy who has no love in his heart. Do not threaten the boy, do not punish him, but coax him and give him prizes, show him things that attract him, and then you will win him back. This is a splendid work, a work which each of you can do; but the danger is when each of you says: "It is not my duty; others will do it." So long as one child walks the Madras streets, helpless and miserable, so long as one girl is left to beg along our thoroughfares, so long as one boy causes terror to his neighbourhood, so long it is your duty and mine to bring forward the help that those helpless ones have a right to demand at our hands. It is thus that some of us have learnt the meaning of religion.

It is not religion simply to go to church or mosque or temple. That is good, but it is not the heart of religion. It is religion to help the little children; it is religion to wipe away the tears of the sorrowful; to nurse the sick; to comfort the afflicted; to make the world a better and a happier place, because you are living in it. In vain do you mark your foreheads, and in vain you wear the green turban of Mecca, which shows that you have been on pilgrimage to that holy post. The true religion is the serving of the helpless,

and thus alone can man testify his faith in the eyes of God and man alike. It is on that ground, friends, that I put before you this Report, in order that you may adopt it, and in order that next year some speaker, standing where I stand, may have the happier task of congratulating you on scores of cases you have saved where now I can only speak of units; on a change in the poorest child population of the city, where now only one or two are helped. Such then, friends, my duty, to ask your help, to plead for your support, and to beg you to make the reception of the Report a reality and not an idle word. Sure am I of this, that as you help the helpless, so will stronger help come down to your own homes and lives. Oh! we are always ready to stretch out empty hands to God and the Angels above us; but full hands must be stretched out to those below us, otherwise the hands held upwards will ever remain unfilled, the cries unanswered from on high.

So I leave this Report, and I know, in so leaving it, that along this path of help His Excellency the Governor will lead us, and give us the privilege of following in the steps that shall save the helpless and make Madras and the Presidency of which it is the capital a happier, because a nobler place than it is to-day.

THE INDENTURE SYSTEM[1]

THE revelations by Mr. C. F. Andrews of what he had seen with his own eyes in Fiji sent a shock of horror through India. But we rested content with the promise of Lord Hardinge that the indenture system should be abolished, and were not sufficiently careful to note his guarding of the promise as to time. There can be little doubt that he intended a very rapid abolition, but his cautious wording is now taken advantage of to put off the redemption of the promise, and to sanction the continuance of the hell upon earth in Fiji for at least another five years of crime, of murders, of suicides, of uttermost degradation, of outraged womanhood. The whole tone of Lord Hardinge's speech shows that no such extension was in his mind, and he could not imagine that Englishmen in England, countrymen of those who abolished slavery, would sanction the continuance in a Colony of indentured slavery, a form of slavery more inhuman and demoralising than chattel slavery, as it existed either in British Colonies or in the Southern States of North America.

Let there be no mistake about what we are doing. A chattel slave is a valuable piece of property, and as such his health, food and housing are looked after by his owner, as the health, food and housing of a valuable horse are looked after. Occasional cruelty there is, as there is occasional cruelty to a horse, but

[1] Reprinted from *The Commonweal*, February 16th, 1917.

the negroes in the Southern States were, as a rule, treated with a fair amount of kindness, and much attachment often existed between owner and slave. The wickedness of the system lay in the fact that they were treated as useful animals, not as men and women; an unfeeling owner would sell away husband from wife, wife from husband, child from parents; a profligate owner would seduce a girl slave; a cruel owner would occasionally flog a slave. But it was the interest of the owner to treat the slave well, and to prolong his working life as much as possible. He was bought for life, or until his owner sold him again. In either case, good physical treatment was to the owner's interest, since on that depended the value, for work or sale, of his property.

But in indentured slavery, the conditions are far worse. The coolie is bought through a "recruiter"—at Rs. 45 for a man, Rs. 55 for a woman, and the cost of the passage has to be added. He is bought for five years only, and during his term his cost must be replaced, and all the possible profit must be made out of him. His strength is to be wrung out of him to the last ounce; any filthy hovel will do for his housing. He can live anyhow, do anything, provided he does not injure his working power. That he is a wreck at the end of the five years matters not at all. He is not property; he is a slave on loan, for whom there is no responsibility when the loan expires. The old slave "mammy" of the South had an idle, happy old age playing with the children. But the loaned slave has no home, no children, no sheltered old age. No one thinks of him; no one cares for him; he is a bit of wreckage on life's current, sweeping on to the sea of death.

The enslaved man is secured by fraudulent promises, the woman is often kidnapped, as are young

boys. They are all ignorant and grossly credulous; the women, taken away from their usual surroundings and protection, are frightened and helpless; the boys are sometimes runaways, or lured away by deceitful promises. Each one is worth so much to the "recruiter". The kidnapper in Africa of negroes is now hunted down on the high seas; the "recruiter" in India is licensed. The coolie-ship rivals the slave-ship; deaths and suicides mark it. Once in the recruiter's grip and taken to a local depot, the woman's fate is certainly, the man's almost always, sealed; the woman's character is gone; she has been taken by a strange man for the night to a place away from her family. Scared and shamed, she is taken before a magistrate; she is registered. The registered coolies are then under the control of the recruiter, who takes them away to the depot in the port whence they are to sail; they are virtually his prisoners, cannot be visited or go out of their depot prison and, after being registered, they are liable to fine and imprisonment if they escape from their gaoler. From the moment that they sign the agreement to emigrate and are registered before a magistrate, they are bondsmen. And to make things worse, a boy is a minor up to 18 years of age by Indian law, and cannot make a valid contract, but by a special section of the Act of 1908, he may sign away his liberty for five years, signing an agreement to emigrate, when he is only 16.

The Act of 1908 is well meant and is obviously intended to protect the emigrant; but what is the use of compelling a recruiter to give a printed statement to the villager he captures, when the villager cannot read? Some villagers do not understand that they are to leave India, that they are to cross the sea; but if, on finding themselves ordered

to go on board they refuse to embark, they are punishable with a month's imprisonment or a fine of Rs. 50.

Now the Governor-General in Council is given power, under the Indian Emigration Act, 1908, to prohibit emigration to any country to which emigration is lawful, and by a notification in the *Gazette of India* he can "declare that emigration to that country shall cease to be lawful from a day specified in the notification". One of the grounds given is "that the mortality among emigrants in the country is excessive". That ground exists in Fiji, for the ratio of ordinary deaths is higher, and that of suicides is some 20 times higher, than in Madras—45 per million commit suicide in Madras, 926 in Fiji. Yet among the free Indian population of Fiji, the proportion is only 14, so that the proportion among the indentured is 66 times that among the free. Is not that enough to be considered as "excessive"? Will H. E. the Viceroy act upon this and stop the emigration at once, or will he assume the ghastly responsibility of allowing it to continue? *It is in his hands.*

It will be said that such prompt action would be ruinous to the planters. They have had nearly a year to improve their arrangements, since Lord Hardinge asked Indians to rejoice that "the indenture system is now doomed," since he promised that it should "soon be removed for ever". And even if it were ruinous to a few men, who have been flourishing on the degradation of their fellows, is it not better that they should lose money than that men should lose all decency, and women all honour? If the wives and daughters of the planters, if the wives and daughters of the English members of the Imperial Council, were in the coolie lines, would they take six years to find a way out, or trouble their heads about the financial

losses to planters? Will the Governor in Council count the money loss to white men as more important than the life and honour of coloured men and women? Surely the colour-bar is not to prevail even here.

At least Indians need not be so careless of human life and honour, so careful of what is truly in this case "filthy lucre". Let them warn the villagers in every recruiting district; let them hang round the offices of Registering Magistrates and officials, and warn the men and women not to sign the agreement to emigrate, explaining to them that they are giving themselves into slavery. Let them spread the knowledge of the conditions in Fiji, of the murders, the hangings, the suicides, the shameless vice, the absence of all decency, the absence of all religion, the reckless despair which drives men to death. Let us "agitate, agitate, agitate" until the law is changed, and meanwhile let us cry aloud in all villages haunted by the recruiter that he is leading men and women into very hell.

We shall yet hope that the Viceroy will realise what is meant by his refusal to exercise the power vested in his hands by the law. The voice of his brothers' blood, of his sisters' shame, is crying to him to use that power, to stop this stream of human victims pouring out of India into a gulf of intolerable woe and disgrace. He cannot refuse; he will not refuse. The countryman of Wilberforce cannot sanction another five years of slavery. One stroke of his pen can free these hapless ones. He can forbid another ship-load of Indian emigrants to go to Fiji. India awaits his answer.

WIDOW-REMARRIAGE [1]

In trying to remove an obvious evil, entailing much suffering, an eager reformer is often apt to make changes without considering their bearing on other matters than the one at which he is aiming, and thus, in removing one limited evil, he brings about others of a more serious and sweeping character. This is especially the case when the reform touches the bases of the social fabric, and where these are concerned, the greatest care and circumspection are needed, lest, in endeavouring to knock off excrescences, we bring down the whole fabric.

In discussing widow-remarriage we must have in view the Hindu ideal of marriage in its bearing on society, and must consider how far such remarriage would affect wifehood in general, with all that the wife means to the home and the State. A fuller presentment of that ideal will be found in the forthcoming book on *Hindu Ideals* than our limits here will allow; let it suffice to say briefly that Hinduism presents man and woman as complementary halves of a single whole, each supplying what the other lacks. It regards the marriage union as applying to all parts of the nature, and as passing therefore unchanged into the worlds beyond death, unmarred by the loss of the physical body. It considers husband and wife as spiritually one, even as they are physically united, and it fosters so intense a love and devotion in the

[1] Reprinted from *The Central Hindu College Magazine*, 1903.

wife to the husband that the ideal Hindu wife could not dream of a transference of that affection to another. In fact, I doubt if any ordinary Hindu wife would tolerate it for a moment. This love to the husband is interwoven with the very fibre of the Hindu woman's life; it comes out in the plea of Savitri to Yama, by which she victoriously wrested her husband from the noose of death: he had promised her sons; then he must restore the husband who could alone make that promise effective; Death admitted the cogency of the plea, and restored the husband to the faithful wife. "Mayst thou be as Savitri," must no longer be said to the young wife, if a second man may draw her to his bosom. And surely it is worthy of consideration whether this intensity of love, with all it implies, is to be eradicated from the hearts of Hindu women, by reducing marriage from a sacrament to a contract.

Many, however, do not advocate the remarriage of widows in general, but only of virgin-widows, and they urge the injustice of shutting out many young girls, many of them mere children, from all the sweetness of wifehood and motherhood. This was put most pathetically and eloquently by Mr. Justice Chandavarkar, in a noble speech, full of passion and sympathy, at a Social Congress. Let us admit to the full that such a lot is generally sad as compared with that of the happy wife and mother; but let us see whether widow-remarriage would avert it, or only transfer it to other shoulders.

In this relation we have to face the fact that there are more marriageable women than marriageable men. Boys die in greater number than girls. There must be, therefore, a surplus of women, either of widows or of spinsters. In the West, there is a large class of unmarried women, shut out from all the joys of

wifehood and motherhood, and often compelled to earn a precarious living by drudgery and prolonged toil. So numerous are these that the education of women has been revolutionised, in order to enable them to compete with men in trades and professions. We do not then solve the problem of the sad lot of solitary women by permitting virgin-widows to remarry. Every widow remarried means one unmarried girl the more. We only transfer the solitariness from the widow to the maid.

Secondly, the large number of virgin-widows is due to child-marriage, and the number would be far more wisely checked by preventing premature marriage than by remarrying widows. The higher death-rate among the boys disappears after 14 years of age. Now the delay of marriage to a reasonable age, at which the girl shall be physiologically fit to bear a child without undue strain on herself, and without entailing physical weakness on her offspring, is demanded alike by science and by morality. This change, necessary if India is not to perish by racial decay, will save large numbers of girls from widowhood, and will abolish child-widowhood entirely.

Thirdly, the lot of widows may be changed by making them the willing helpers of their sex, by training them as teachers and as nurses, and by thus making widowhood a consecration to the service of humanity. In the West, tens of thousands of women willingly embrace the celibate life, in order to devote themselves to intercessory prayer and meditation, or to serve as nurses of the sick poor, as educators of the young, as guardians of helpless orphans and the friendless aged. How many good works in India are crippled for lack of such a class, and Indian girls are taught, and Indian orphans are cared for, by Christian women, because none of their own faith are available

for such charitable duties. Here is a vast field of noble labour, of peaceful and happy usefulness for any Indian widows whose hands are not already filled with helpful service in their own homes. Society cannot exist without the service of self-abnegating women, who are free from immediate personal ties. Widowhood is a call to such service, and lives thus passed have the sweetest consolations for the loss of husband's and of children's love.

Some who take the highest view of marriage urge that the widower should not remarry any more than the widow; and doubtless no second marriage would follow a perfect marriage. The wife would ever remain the wife; none other would share her throne. None the less we may recognise the fact that nature enforces a certain difference in the love borne by husband to wife and by wife to husband. The long months during which the woman bears within her body the coming child, weave into her being a tenderer and more clinging and dependent love than that of the man; the subtle physical and emotional energies which build up the babe affect the whole of the mother's nature, and the father of her child becomes the centre of a golden web of pure and passionate feelings. He stands for her apart from all humanity, he, whose creative touch transformed her into mother, and wrought in her the miracle of the child. Unconsciously this difference is felt, even when not reasoned on, and popular feeling regards differently the remarriage of the widower and of the widow. There are other reasons for this feeling, historical and social, but for the present this may suffice. But in any case, those who urge perpetual widowhood for men as well as for women will raise, not lower, the ideal of marriage.

INDIAN WOMEN[1]

LITERATURE can show no grander types of womanhood than are to be found in the great epic poems of India, types sketched in by master hands from noble models, and uniting in a few heroic figures all that is at once strongest and sweetest, most lofty and most devoted in humanity. Sita, the wife of Rama, who follows her beloved to the forest when he is exiled from throne and country, who lives there contentedly by his side, bringing into the hut of the forester all the grace and beauty of the court; who, torn away from his side by force, keeps her faith unsullied and her courage undaunted through bonds and in face of death; who, her chastity assailed by unworthy suspicions, meets accusation with a dignity that is austere, endurant, gentle; never was more heroic figure limned by man than the Sita of Valmiki. And Savitri who wrenched her husband from the icy grip of death, and Shakuntala, who, according to Goethe, is the one whose name we utter to express all that is best in womanhood. And Kaushalya, ideal mother. And—but I might run through a long list of names and not exhaust the wealth of noble women that India has borne to the race. In those days the Aryan woman was free, dignified, and strong; she stood beside her husband at the altar, for without her he could not discharge his priestly duties in the home; she stood beside him in life, through death, in the gladder life beyond; she was not separable from him, but a part of his very self.

[1] Reprinted from *The New York World*, June 3rd, 1896.

lady—a learned Sanskritist and master of seven languages—is at the head, and she is assisted by a small staff of competent Brahmana teachers. In Mysore, the Indian Ruler, supported by his ministers, is making great exertions to open schools for girls, and in other parts of Hindustan, under both Indian and British rule, similar efforts are being made. The Parsis, in Bombay, are doing good work in this direction. The fact, however, that I wish to emphasise is that an Indian woman may be very highly cultured, with a mind stored with religious and literary knowledge, and yet be unable to read or write. I have mentioned above the exclusion of women from the study of the Vedas. This is not the restriction of the most ancient times, but it is found in *Manu*, the recognised legal authority. It is not, however, applied to all women, for those who show special capacity may be thus instructed. Some of the Vaidic hymns, indeed, are ascribed to female authors, and the names of celebrated women have come down to us, who took part in assemblies of Brahmanas and discussed the abstrusest points of metaphysics without any sex impediment being placed in the way. So, also, women embrace the ascetic life and become great Yoginis, reverenced by all, and the proud Brahmanas will touch the feet of a woman teacher who shows the knowledge of spiritual truth and power to impart it.

When the girl is betrothed in infancy or girlhood—a custom, let me say in passing which cannot be justified by any appeal to the Hindu scriptures or to antiquity, and which has grown up gradually, being probably largely due to an anxiety on the part of fathers to secure a protector for their daughters in troublous and unsettled times—she passes to her husband's home after puberty, and is in charge of his

mother, whom she is then to regard as her own. She is taught to love, serve, obey her husband in all things; to her he is to be as a God. And here comes in the general principle spoken of above; his faults do not excuse any failure in her duty; she is taught to be the ideal wife, whether or not he be the ideal husband, and though both continually fail, the ideal is still taught and recognised. Through the husband come to the wife all the blessings of the Gods, while her devotion and piety keep firm the foundations of the home. Heavy is the penalty that falls on him who neglects his wife, who is unfaithful to her, who treats her with aught but tenderness; but she must remain faithful however dutiless he may be. "In that family where the husband is pleased with his wife and the wife with her husband happiness will assuredly be lasting."[1]

If the wife deifies her husband, as mother she is deified in her turn. The son is bidden worship his mother, and in everything he must consult her and avoid giving her pain. She is bracketed with the father and the spiritual teacher, sometimes put above them, and "all duties have been fulfilled by him who honours these three; but to him who honours them not, all rites remain fruitless".[2]

The mother rules the household with absolute authority, save as it may be tempered by the grandmother, and there is no appeal from their will. The orthodox Hindu bows to these women, who have over him the sacred authority of parentage, and will face serious personal sacrifice rather than cross their

[1] *Manu*, iii, 60.
[2] *Manu*, xi, 324.

wish. Very clearly on the general question of the position of woman speaks our Manu:

> Women must be honoured and adorned by their fathers, brothers, husbands, and brothers-in-law, who desire welfare. Where women are honoured, there the Gods are pleased; but where they are not honoured, no sacred rite yields rewards. Where the female relations live in grief, the family soon wholly perishes; but that family where they are not unhappy ever prospers. The houses on which female relations, not being duly honoured, pronounce a curse, perish completely, as if destroyed by magic.[1]

This closeness and sacredness of family ties may render partly intelligible the horror felt by Hindus, men and women alike, about the idea of widow-marriage. The maiden given in marriage becomes a member of the family to which her husband belongs; she bears children into it and becomes to them an incarnate Goddess, presiding in the sanctuary of the home. The husband dies, but she is still a part of him, daughter of his parents, mother of his children, a stone in the family house; shall she be wrenched out thence to be built into another household, loosening all the other stones, shattering the family altar?

Not only is this so as regards the family, but also as regards the husband; for he is not dead, he has only put off his body, and he must be served with due rites on the other side of death. The marriage union is of souls and spirits, as well as of bodies; as well remarry when the husband goes a journey on this earth as when he travels onward to the land beyond the grave. It is sacrilege, it is adultery, it makes marriage a commercial contract, a union of

[1] *Manu*, iii, 55-58.

bodies only, as well as disintegrating the sacred life of the family, which is the dearest pride of the Hindu.

It may be said that this view is not enforced on men; they may remarry. That is so, for the man in remarrying does not dislocate the family, but only brings into it another member. No tie is broken, either to ancestors or to children; all remains intact. Nor is the union with the first wife regarded as broken by the second marriage, and both will dwell happily "in the heavenly places" with him they love. Nor does it apply to the marriage of virgin-widows, that have been betrothed or wedded in childhood and have never passed into the family circle of the new home. We, therefore, find that many Hindus who stand stoutly against a second marriage for a woman who has lived with her husband are prepared to accept the marriage of virgin-widows. The strictest Hindus oppose it, partly as lessening the sacredness of marriage by reducing it to a mere physical union, and partly from the ubiquitous fear of "the thin end of the wedge". Probably the easiest way out of the difficulty would be to get rid of child-marriage, and so of virgin-widows.

For the lot of the child-widow is hard, as things are. Exceptional natures, who see beyond physical things will accept such a lot, not joyously but not unwillingly, and will consecrate themselves to a life of service and tender devotion, becoming the veritable "angels of the home," reverenced and beloved. I have two women in my mind now, exquisite types of gentle dignity and serenity, with faces divinely pure and compassionate. But taking the ordinary run of Hindu girls they are not fit for this selfless life of ministration, and they fret sometimes against the enforced austerity for which they are not ripe. The Hindu ideal of marriage

is pitched too high for the modern Hindu, man or woman, and with the failure of marriage remarriage becomes less disastrous.

Trying to give a general idea of the fundamental position of the Hindu woman, I have left myself no space to deal with the variations introduced by local customs and traditions, such as the zenana system of the north and the freedom of the south. Yet on ideas founded on the northern system many criticisms are based which are not applicable to the general system.

It may be asked whether the Hindu type of womanhood is one that it is desirable to spread among Western nations. The answer may bluntly be made that such spreading is impossible. That delicate, gracious, sweet and tender type, with its gentle courtesy, its serene dignity, could not endure in the rush of Western life and the self-assertiveness of Western civilisation.

One might as well picture Savitri in a divorce court, or Sita suing the cobbler for damages in a libel suit. Leave the Hindu woman untouched by Western thought and do not destroy a type which, just because it is unique, would leave less full by its disappearance the chord of humanity. We have women enough who are brilliantly intellectual and competent; let us leave unmarred the one type which is the incarnation of spiritual beauty.

IV. RELIGIOUS

THE NATURE OF MY RELIGIOUS WORK[1]

THE attitude of the Theosophist to the great religions of the world is one that gives rise to many misconceptions, and it may be worth while to take advantage of the remarks made by the Rev. C. Philip Cape at the Wesleyan Conference last week on my own Indian work to explain that attitude. His remarks have been reprinted in many newspapers with big head-lines, so that they raise an issue which it is thought will interest the public. I will try to put as clearly as possible my reasons for adopting what is, to me, the true Theosophical attitude.

Theosophy, or the Divine Wisdom, has as its essence the teaching that direct knowledge of God is possible to man because man is a Spirit, whose nature is divine; to use a Christian phrase, man is a partaker of the divine nature. Secondarily, it puts forth as its teachings the fundamental truths which are found in all the great religions, separating these from the methods, ceremonies, and additional special doctrines peculiar to each special faith. To illustrate: it would put forth the idea that the spiritual and the natural worlds may be brought into close relation with each other; but it would not impose on any the use of the special sacraments found in the Hindu, Christian, and other faiths. It would explain special sacraments, showing the laws utilised by them, but would

[1] Reprinted from the *Christian Commonwealth* of July 31, 1912.

not hold that the sacraments of one religion should be pressed on members of another communion who already possess their own. It sees in the sacraments of each religion particular examples of a general law. The existence of the Universal Life—God; His three aspects in manifestation; Incarnation of Spirit in Matter; the great Orders of Living Beings; the two basic laws—Action and Reaction, Sacrifice; the three worlds of human evolution—earth, intermediate, heaven; the Brotherhood of Man; these are universally taught by the great religions, and may be found in their scriptures. The variety of presentation is an advantage rather than a disadvantage, as each religion expresses its own peculiar quality and brings out its own special note, none of which can be dispensed with.

Hence the Theosophist reverences *all* religions, and is equally ready to serve any one of them; if he is well instructed and *feels* the unity, he can express himself equally well in the language of any religion, and will always choose that language in addressing its adherents. He will not talk to a Hindu in Christian phraseology, nor to a Christian in Hindu phraseology; he will not seek to Christianise the Hindu, but will try to help the Hindu to become a more liberal, enlightened and spiritual Hindu. He will not seek to Hinduise the Christian, but will try to help the Christian to become a more liberal, enlightened, and spiritual Christian. In any country he will seek to serve the religion, or religions, of the country in which he is, but will not help or countenance any attack by one religion on another. "His watchword is Peace."

There you have the explanation of my attitude in India. I lecture in Ceylon and Burma on Buddhist lines, trying to help the Sinhalese and Burmans to be

better Buddhists; we have aided them to have schools and colleges in which their own religion is taught. In India I lecture on Hindu lines to Hindus, trying to help them to be better Hindus; we have many schools and one big college in which Hinduism is taught. I lecture to the Parsis on Zoroastrianism, to the Muhammadans on Islam, trying to help them to be better Parsis and better Muslims. I have lectured to a general audience of Indians on Christianity, trying to show them that it was a much greater and nobler religion than the fighting forms of it which are all they know; and I have lectured on Islam in London, trying to show its greatness to an English audience. But in England I try to help Christians to become better Christians, not to induce them to change their faith.

I think it is true that by helping Hindus, Buddhists, Parsis and Muhammadans to value their own faiths more deeply and to live them more truly, I *do* become an obstacle to Christian missions. They fail to convert those who have learned the value and greatness of their own faiths. So have I brought back many lapsed Christians to Christianity in England. I never attack Christianity—that goes without saying; I praise the medical and educational work of missionaries, though I have pointed out that the religious side of their education makes the boys materialists, for they destroy the boy's faith in his own religion and sterilise his religious nature, so that they cannot implant in him their own faith; I therefore urge parents of all faiths to have schools and colleges in which their own faith is taught, rather than send their children to missionary schools where their beliefs are imperilled. I have also expressed dissent from missionary propaganda, and from the direction of ridicule and abuse against Indian faiths, such as the

statement of Father Elwin lately that "Hinduism is an invention of Satan". I think it wrong to outrage any man's belief, and I think that missionary propaganda in civilised countries tends to promote racial antagonisms. This I have said both in England and in India.

The nature of my religious influence in India, then, is to strengthen each faith in the hearts of its followers and to discountenance attempts to invade one faith in the interest of another. Some will approve, some will disapprove my line of action; it is the one that Theosophy teaches me to follow, and "I can no other".

THE ANCIENT INDIAN IDEAL OF DUTY[1]

AMONG all the religions of the world, there is none which has so bound up in itself the private life of the individual with the public life of the nation and the State, as the religion of the Sanatana Dharma, which has laid down at once a polity and a social organisation, of which the foundations are eternally true and which only needs to-day new applications to meet the new needs of life. I want, if I can, this evening very briefly to show you how an Institution such as you have here, based on the fundamental ideas of the Sanatana Dharma, trying to apply itself to modern needs, is one which is really based on truth, not only here, but everywhere else; and just in proportion as you of this ancient faith can realise its value and live its truth, so the whole world will look to India for guidance, so the whole world will become grateful to India as the preserver of the life of religion. I am not specially concerned with the small details of the Sanatana Dharma. It is the broad outlines that I want to remind you of, in order that you may realise the answer which they contain to the pressing needs of our day. First of all you will notice—when you compare the fundamental idea of the Sanatana Dharma with that of modern Western life—that two ideals are held up by the one and by the other, of which the Eastern is the idea of *duty*, and the Western of *rights*. Now, on the difference between those two fundamental conceptions

[1] A lecture delivered at the Anniversary Meeting of the Shrinivasa Mandiram, Bangalore, in 1910.

of human organisation, of national life, the whole of the future will turn.

As you know, the fundamental thought of the people of the East has been the thought embodied in that one word "DHARMA". Every man has his Dharma. But what does Dharma mean? It means the obligations into which every man is born, the obligations which surround him from the moment of his birth. The obligations to the family, the obligations to the community, the obligations to the nation —these are the Dharma into which every human being comes by the gateway of birth It is not an arbitrary thing but a natural one. It is not a thing which is created, but it is a thing which comes. out of the long course of evolution. And out of that fundamental idea of Dharma comes the thought that the first thing in human life which makes it possible is the fact that that obligation is recognised and righteously discharged. When the baby is born into the family, helpless, unable to feed itself, lying there without strength, without ability, naked, feeble, what is it that preserves the life of the babe? It is the duty of the mother and of the father, the duty of the elder to the younger, the sense of obligation which surrounds, helps, guards and preserves the babe through the years of childhood and of youth: out of that discharge of duty to the child, grows the obligation of the child to the family and the community. The elders guard the child in infancy. The child in its manhood must repay the obligations in its turn. Thus you come to the idea of Manu of the debts which every man is bound to pay; the debt to the Devas for giving him the whole of the natural advantages, the whole of the gifts of nature by which alone life is possible; the debt to the ancestors whose labours he has inherited, and by the fruits of whose

progress his life is rendered possible to-day; the debt to the human beings around him; to the animals below him; his debt to the Sages of the past; all these he comes into; they make the obligations into which he is born, which he must pay back by the useful life of the man, the father and the citizen. Out of that idea of human duty, out of that recognition of human obligation, out of the realisation that we are beings on whom duty has a claim—out of that grows the stability and the orderly progress of human society.

Now, in the West, another idea grew up, which is really less than two centuries old—it is the idea that the human being is not a part of an organisation but is an isolated individual, that he stands alone and apart, and that the fact of birth clothes him with certain rights. The "declaration of the rights of man," the famous historic phrase, sums up in a single statement that modern idea of human and national life. According to that, society is not based on a common obligation; it is based on the inherent rights of the individual which he may enforce by any means in his power. Law is only binding because people have accepted it and consented to it, and not because it is based on nature and expresses the Divine Will. Kings, according to this, rule not by the grace of God, but only by the acceptance of the people. Everything is based on the idea of the right of the individual, which he only yields partially in order that he may enjoy the remainder the more fully. His interests are antagonistic to the interests of others, instead of being common and universally binding upon all. This idea has grown and spread during the last 150 years. The result has been continual struggle, disturbance and difficulty. The assembly of the nation is no longer the representative

of the nation as a whole, but merely of a body of interests, one conflicting with the other. The members of the modern Houses of Legislature do not represent the common interests of the whole nation, and so you have the modern struggle, the modern turmoil, the modern quarrels, and the danger of the dissolution of the modern civilisation.

But strangely enough, there has come in the West a reinforcement of the Eastern ideal. Science has grown up and science has studied nature. Instead of manufacturing paper-constitutions and imaginary rights of man, science has declared that human beings, like all other things, are the result of evolution, and that individuality is subordinate to the common good, and the benefit of a part is subordinate to the good of the whole. Science is again declaring that society is an organism, and not a body of people based on an imaginary contract. Science is declaring, again, one life, as religion has always been declaring it; and just as Hinduism has proclaimed the one Life, the universal Spirit, and *therefore* the solidarity of man, so is modern science declaring one life and one consciousness in all, and therefore that society is a growing organism, in which every one has duties growing out of his life in the social unity. Thus, from the West is coming the reinforcement of the ancient theory of Dharma of the East, and it is for the East to proclaim now the predominance, the superiority of an organisation that demands from every man discharge of duty, and realises that on that discharge alone the whole well-being of society depends. But that is not the only vitalising influence which the Sanatana Dharma exercises on the world. It proclaims also the necessity of *Order*.

There again, Western science is beginning to strengthen Eastern religion. Science also proclaims

Law and Order as the essential conditions of progress. Science has discovered that only by order is it possible for humanity to evolve. Of all the codes of human life that have ever been given to the world, that code which is known by the name of Manu—the great Lawgiver—is the most orderly and the most perfect in its arrangement. Here is another gift that you have in your hands to give to the Western world.

After the idea of Dharma, what are the next ideas that come forward in the Hindu polity? The next idea is that all mankind is divided into two enormous groups: one walking on the path of pursuit, the Pravritti Marga—the path of going forth; and the other those that turn their faces homeward, that are treading the Nivritti Marga. How does this apply to human life? It shows us that the ordinary life of man, the common life of every day, is but a part of the divinely ordained evolution by which the progress of humanity is governed; and on the path of going forth, the Pravritti Marga, are laid down the rightful objects of all human effort. First comes the Dharma that I have spoken of, the duty that guides and limits; and then Artha—possessions in the widest sense, all that the world has to give and all that man is able to possess. Man, according to Hindu Dharma, is not to be an ascetic while he is treading the Pravritti Marga. He is told, on the contrary, that the enjoyment of possessions, the gathering of wealth, progress in worldly matters, all belong rightfully and usefully to that path of pursuit. Those who know the Hindu Dharma will realise that this is so, and that in modern India much confusion has arisen, with the result that this teaching is for the most part forgotten. Modern India has talked too much of the path of return—the Nivritti Marga—quite forgetting that that is the path

for the few, while the path of forthgoing is the path for the many. They forget that Manu laid down for his children the pursuit of possessions and the enjoyment of pleasure. Artha and Kama are the objects of the path of pursuit, limited and guided by Dharma. How much more wise was the ancient Lawgiver than are many of our modern teachers, those who would have every man an ascetic, those who declare that renunciation is the only rightful path of human life. Manu, the Lawgiver, is the wisest of the Divine rulers of man, and Manu realised that for national prosperity, effort and enjoyment were needed; that it was right that those who were evolving should evolve their faculties by effort and by enjoyment, and so possessions and pleasure were made part of the path of forthgoing. And the great masses of the people were pointed to that, as the path by which progress was to be made. Only when a man has trodden that path, only when he has developed high intelligence, only when he has developed unselfishness and the pure love of God, then is he ready to turn his face homeward and tread the path of renunciation. Then it is that Bhakti, the Love of God, takes the place of Kama—the love of the objects of desire. Then it is that the Siddhis and the powers that they give, take the place of the worldly possessions, powers to be used only for the benefit of man and not for the gain of the possessor. Then it is that, instead of the outward law of Dharma imposing duty from without, there comes Mukti, the freedom of the Self made manifest, who needs no law from without, because he realises his divinity, and forsaking all Dharma, he becomes one with the Supreme Being and the Divine Will is his. Such is the course of human life according to Manu, balanced, rational and useful for all. No asceticism, premature and therefore useless, but the full development of

faculties; only when these have been developed may come the turning home, the treading of the path to liberation. Step by step, in orderly and progressive fashion, Manu bids man tread the path of human life.

The last of the great principles given by Manu for the evolution of man is what is called the Varnashrama: varna, the stage of the human soul, the ego, the division of men into classes according to their characteristics; and ashrama, the stages of the individual life through which each should repeatedly pass.

Now, much is said for and against caste—something in its favour by those who know the turmoil of classes in the West, something against it by those in India who feel its barriers rather than its value, and resent the privileges claimed by some because duty has been forgotten by these while only privileges are claimed. And yet, rightly looked at, that fourfold division brings a detailed answer to the problems of human life afore-mentioned. What is the first problem that is pressing on every nation? That of the education of the young. There is not an assembly in the world, from the Parliament of Great Britain to the Legislative Council of the Viceroy, and down to the smallest Municipality that has to guide the welfare of a part of the community—there is not one that is not standing puzzled and bewildered before the great problem of the education of the people. How should that be solved? There is one way—though no public leader yet has suggested it—that has within it the power of solution, and that is by the recognition of real castes, and among them the caste of teachers. Your Dharma as Brahmanas—those of you who are Brahmanas—is not the gathering of wealth and the holding of places of power, but the gathering of knowledge and the imparting of that knowledge to the people. If the

Brahmanas would only do that duty as Brahmanas, then there would be no educational problems in India to-day. But the Brahmanas, instead of doing their duty by imparting instruction, are busy in administering justice—which is properly the function of the Kshattriya; they are busy gathering wealth—which is properly the duty of the Vaishya. Worldly men rebel against the Brahmana because he has forgotten his duty and no longer fills his proper position in the State. If we had true Brahmanas in India, all educational problems would be solved; for there would be Brahmanas in every village, and every village would have its teachers, and then education would be given as duty, as in the older time, and not for money as at present. You may say that this is a very fine idea, but how are you going to persuade your Brahmana caste to give up all power and make itself available to promote the welfare of the people? I don't expect to get it from the grown-up men, those who are middle-aged and mature, those who are old and hardened by the life of the world, and I am sure no words of mine would move them to have recourse to the path of renunciation which is the path of the Brahmana. But I have hope in the younger men of India, who are growing up to-day in schools and colleges. I have hope in those sons of India who are vowing themselves to the public weal, and are ready to labour for the public good. I believe that we shall see growing up a new Brahmana caste, a caste which will be known by quality more than by birth, and by characteristics more than by outward marks, a class that will see the glory of sacrifice, a class that will realise the happiness of renunciation; these young men, full of enthusiasm, full of passionate devotion, who have in them the passion of self-devotion, which ought to be the mark of a Brahmana;

in these is my hope; and I believe that we shall find actually growing up in India an order of young men who, between the time when college life ends and the householder life begins, will give themselves up to some years of service for the welfare of the nation, and give that service to the masses of the people in order to elevate, guide and inspire them. It is on the young men of India that I place my hope for the redemption of the masses of India from ignorance and degradation.

And so, when it is realised that the problems of government, the problems of legislation, the problems of the administration of justice, the problems of the army, and of the navy, and of the police, are all problems that belong to the old ideal of Manu of the Kshattriya caste, when it is realised that the Kshattriyas are the defenders and guardians of the nation, that it is on them that the burden of guiding the nation should fall as a matter of duty, then we shall have growing up a caste of Kshattriyas educated for their work, and capable of performing it most efficiently. Then we shall see disappearing all discontent arising from the oppression of the people by any of those who carry on the nation's working to-day. For instance, let me speak of the police. These are fundamentally a part of the great Kshattriya caste by their office. We know how many complaints are made in India against men taken from the lower grades of society, who are invested with authority they are constantly tempted to misuse. If we realise that for public service training in youth is necessary; if we realise that those who are to take the varied offices in the State, even the lowest of them, should be trained for those offices in youth; if it were understood that when a man joins the police, he should

have been trained for his responsibilities previously; if it is only realised that he should have been trained here as the police are trained in England; if it were only realised that for purposes of public service he should be the friend of the common people; how different would be the feelings of people in India towards the police, and how willing would be the help given by the ordinary citizen whenever he was asked for it in the name of the law! It is when you realise the functions necessary for the well-being of a community, that you realise the wisdom of the ancient Lawgiver—how he made the functions separate in order that each class might discharge the same well. The teacher was one class; the warrior, the protector, another; the merchant a third class, the makers of wealth, in order that thereby the nation as a whole might prosper.

Looking for a moment at modern India, such a sketch as I am giving to you now seems an impossible Utopia. But nothing is impossible; for thought creates action, and that which a man thinks, inevitably comes to pass. We want to hold up the old ideal; not to force any man to follow it, if he does not see it to be admirable. We hold it up, that all men may see it. It will gradually dominate the public mind and bring about its realisation. When we are able to re-form a caste of teachers, a caste of legislators and administrators of justice, a caste of those who organise industry and accumulate wealth, a class of manual labourers who follow a particular craft or a particular art which is needed for the welfare of the people—all equally honourable and equally necessary, and all equally essential to the nation's welfare, and when the old idea of duty returns and each knows his duty and does it, then shall we again make the Golden Age, and a happier day shall break

upon our earth. For this is what the West is looking for to-day. It realises its own turmoil, its own dislocation. It realises that constant struggle cannot be the natural and the fitting state of man. It is gradually despairing of the feasibility of its methods, and is looking elsewhere for light. Where should the light come from? From the East, where the Sun is ever shining, where the laws of the Great Lawgiver were given to all his Aryan children, not only to those who settled in India, but to those who wandered westward and lost their way back to their father's home. So, here in India, this ideal can again be restored, adapted to modern ways, flexible as it was in the older time. If, as in the past, men's qualities were regarded as well as their family, then family would take its rightful place as one of the factors in human evolution, which is largely dependent on physical heredity; but to-day the ego that comes into any particular body is often unsuitable; because Dharma has been neglected, there is confusion of caste to-day. Because the higher castes have not done their duty, physical heredity is no longer a guide to caste as it was in the older days, and yet physical heredity is a law of nature and cannot wisely be ignored in national life. Sometimes men wonder how all the sub-castes have sprung up. They have often sprung up by natural differentiation in the quality of the physical body, which follows a special occupation of brain or hand. There is no "caste" in England, but you know that in Lancashire, the spinners and weavers of cotton cloths have grown up so much in families that employers of labour give larger wages to a boy or girl coming from a weaving family than they will give to a similar boy or girl coming from some part of the country where weaving is not a hereditary occupation. That is the way in which nature works. That is the justification

of family trades. Only it has grown far too rigid here in India, and intermarriage and inter-dining also are forbidden between sub-castes. This is, of course, one of the things that will have to disappear; for though physical heredity gives variety to the community as a whole, yet it is not necessary constantly to intermarry too closely, and thus weaken that strength which you desire to maintain.

Complicated are the questions of national life, and complicated are the problems to be dealt with. But it is in that ancient Law, in the Sanatana Dharma, that answers to the modern problems are to be found. But remember that, according to Manu himself, when circumstances change, the old principles are to be adapted to those changed conditions; for which reason customs should be kept flexible, instead of being inflexible as they are in the India of to-day. Much lies in the hands of the educators of the young. All those who follow the ancient rules should bring up the young to work for the reform of India, to make her what she should be, flexible, elastic, adapting herself to the needs of modern life; but in all they should hold firm to the fundamental principles, for these are the conditions of national prosperity. They hold, as I said, the solution of national problems.

Now at the end I go back to the place from which I started.

It is your duty as Hindus, as citizens, to help every effort in your midst which is based on the old principles, and which tries to adapt them to the changed conditions of human life. Stretch out your hand in help to all efforts for human improvement; strengthen those of your fellow-citizens whom you find able to guide the young and help the old along the path that combines modern progress with the ancient wisdom.

ISLAM IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY

I AM to speak this evening on Islam in the Light of Theosophy. Let me begin by saying a word or two as to the relation of that which is called "Theosophy" to the great religions of the world. As you can at once see by the name, if we translate it into English, it means simply "Divine Wisdom". By that name is indicated THE WISDOM in its relation to all the religions of the world. Every religion in its turn has grown up from the great Root of the Divine Wisdom. Every religion in its place is an exposition of the Divine Life in humanity, and so this teaching which takes only the name of the Divine Wisdom, without any sectarian limitation, is the fervent helper and defender of every religion which has uplifted and consoled humanity. It is no one religion, but *every* religion, that has in it a friend and a defender.

Sometimes some of our Christian brethren have regarded Theosophy as inimical to the great religion of the West. But that is a misconception, probably arising from the fact that Theosophy has strengthened Eastern faith against aggression, and has also pointed out the additions and omissions which have injured popular Christianity in the present, just as it has pointed out similar additions and omissions in popular Hinduism and Buddhism. Theosophy has stood as a defender of every faith of the Western or the Eastern world. For everywhere in these days religion is attacked, and its defence becomes the duty of a true

Theosophist; and in the East, especially in India, where the religions of Hinduism and Islam have their home and their numerous adherents, wherever those religions are attacked, Theosophy becomes defensive and stands in the breach against attacks, to explain, to illuminate and to defend. But none the less in the Western lands, in Christendom, Theosophy is the servant of Christianity, as it is here the servant of Hinduism, Zoroastrianism and Islam. There, in the West, at last it is being recognised as filling up a great gap in the defence of Christianity, not against the attacks of any other religion, but against the attacks of materialism, against the attacks of scientific thought, where that scientific thought has no spiritual ideal. So everywhere Theosophy comes forward to explain and to illuminate.

In this country of India, where so large a proportion of Indians belong to the great faith of the Prophet Muhammad, there are some seventy million people who regard Him as the chief messenger of God. Here naturally Theosophy comes in to help all those who follow that faith. Their position among the religions of the world is not as fully recognised as it ought to be; that is, Islam is not regarded as it should be by very many, as one of the great exponents of Divine Wisdom. Taken as a religion, it is often unfairly attacked because it is utterly misunderstood, as to the greatness of its Prophet and the nobility of His teachings to the world. Oftentimes in the West you find attacks on Islam made on the ground that it is fanatically persecuting and not progressive; on the ground that the position of woman in Islam is not such as it should be; on the ground that it does not encourage learning, science and intellectual endeavour. These are the three

chief attacks which the Westerns make against Islam. I want, towards the conclusion of what I have to say, to show you that these attacks are not justified by the teachings of the Prophet, and are controverted by the services which Islam has rendered to the world. It is true that to-day Islam does not stand before the world as the exponent of high learning, of great intellectual endeavours, but that is not due to the fault of the teachings but rather to the neglecting of them. Islam has suffered, as all the other religions of the world have suffered, because its followers are unworthy of its Founder.

Now Islam differs from the other religions of the world in one important fact. With regard to its Founder, the Prophet, there is no intermixture in His history of the mythic element which surrounds the other great religious Teachers; His life was led in times that are regarded as historical. In the seventh century of the Christian era, this Man was born and lived out His life in lands the history of which is known.

How splendidly His life can face the light, how utterly ignorant are they who attack the Prophet Muhammad, is shown by history. Many do not know the history of His life—so simple, so heroic, and so noble in its outlines; one of the great lives of historic men. He was born in difficult times, surrounded by difficult circumstances; born amongst a people who were sunk in superstition; born amidst a people in whom superstitions were bearing their most evil fruits. We shall see in a moment from the testimony of those He converted, from the words of those who bore witness to Him whilst still He lived, and who held him Prophet of God, what were the lives of the masses of the people. But even before this, He stands out as a Light in the darkness, and we find

His life so noble and so true that we realise why He was chosen out to bear to all those around Him the Message of His Lord. What was the name by which all men, women and children in Mecca knew Him? It was the name of Al-Amin, the Trustworthy. I know of no higher and nobler epithet than that with which they named this man who had been amongst them from His youth—the man worthy of trust. It is told of Him that when He walked in the streets, the children ran out from the doors and clung to His knees and hands. Where you have these two qualities in one character—the love of children and a character that makes the men around Him call him the Trustworthy—you have the elements of a Hero, of a born Leader, of a Teacher of men.

It is a story of great significance, that of those fifteen weary years of struggle, of thoughts, of meditation, of living in the life of the world and then away for a time in the cave of the desert; He wrestled with thoughts that at first overpowered Him, and He shrank with the weakness of a man against the call from the powers of Spirit. It is noteworthy that when He came back from that cave one night when the Angel of the Lord had bidden Him: "Rise, O Prophet of God, and go forth and cry to the people," He shivered, fearing and doubting: "Who am I, what am I, that I should go as Prophet of the Lord?" It was then that His wife cheered Him up, bidding Him obey the call. "Fear not," she said, "art thou not the Trustworthy? Never will God deceive a man trusted by men." Nowhere can there be a fairer testimony to a Prophet. Then He went forth to His great mission; the wife of His bosom was His first disciple, that dearest and noblest of women who lived with this Leader of men for twenty-six years of perfect married life. Such was the

character of the Man as judged by her who knew Him best.

Now it is said popularly that a Prophet is without honour in his own country. This Prophet was not without honour in His own country and in His father's house. He was honoured in the hearts of His relatives, and from them He won His first disciples. His wife, as just said, was His first disciple, and then came those who were nearest akin to Him, and then others amongst those whom He loved. After three years of patient labour there were thirty who recognised Him as the Prophet of the Lord. And how simple and frugal his life. He mended his broken shoes, patched his own coat—tailor and cobbler for himself, even when, towards the close of His life, thousands around Him bowed down to Him as Prophet. Such was the character of the Man—so simple, so noble, so straightforward.

One day He was talking to a rich man when a blind man cried aloud: "O Prophet of God, teach me the way of salvation." Muhammad did not listen, for He was talking to a wealthy man. Again he cried aloud: "O Prophet of God, show me the way of salvation." The Prophet frowned, and turned aside. On the very next morning there came a message that for ever remains in *Al Quran,* as testimony to His honesty and humility, "wherein He put it that all might remember".

The Prophet frowned and turned aside because the blind man came to him; and how dost thou know whether he shall peradventure be cleansed from his sins, or whether he shall be admonished and the admonition shall profit him? The man who is wealthy thou receivest respectfully; whereas it is not to be charged on thee that he is not cleansed: but him who cometh unto thee earnestly

seeking his salvation, and who feareth God, dost thou reject. By no means shouldst thou act thus.

Few men would be brave enough to publish such a reprimand, addressed directly to themselves; but, on the contrary, so great was this Man and so true, that afterwards, whenever He saw this blind man, He rose and brought him forward, saying: "Welcome, because it was for thee my Lord reprimanded me." So great He was that the slightest weakness and breach of kindness were promptly recognised, and the man who was the cause of the reprimand He held as dear and honoured him. No wonder that we find that all men loved Him who were near to Him.

This love that His immediate followers, who knew Him personally, had for Muhammad was one of the most touching in the history of the world's religions. His followers were persecuted in a most ghastly way; they put them on the heated sand with the scorching Arabian sun burning down on them; they piled stones upon them; they refused them a single drop of water to moisten their parched lips; they tore them into fragments; one man was cut to pieces bit by bit, his flesh torn piecemeal from his bones, and they said to him in the midst of his agony: "Thou believest in thy Prophet; wouldst not thou rather that Muhammad were in thy place, and thou at home?" Answers the dying man: "As God is my witness, I would not be at home with wife and children and substance, if Muhammad were for that to be pricked by a single thorn." Thus you may learn how this Man was loved by His followers.

There is nothing more pathetic than an incident which took place after a battle, one of the early battles where His troops had conquered, and there was great spoil taken. The Prophet divided

the spoil, and those who were nearest to Him and who had helped Him longest and best had no share in the division. They were angered and secretly murmured. Thereat He called them around Him and said :

"I have known a discourse you held among yourselves. When I came amongst you, you were wandering in darkness, and the Lord gave you the right direction ; you were suffering, and He made you happy ; at enmity among yourselves, and He has filled your hearts with brotherly love, and has given you victory. Was it not so, tell me?" "Indeed, it is even as thou sayest," was the reply, "to the Lord and His Prophet belong benevolence and grace." "Nay, by the Lord," continued the Prophet, "but ye might have answered, and answered truly—for I would have testified to its truth myself—'Thou camest to us rejected as an impostor and we believed in Thee ; Thou camest as a helpless fugitive, and we assisted Thee ; poor and an outcast, and we gave Thee an asylum ; comfortless, and we solaced Thee.' Why disturb your hearts because of the things of this life ? Are ye not satisfied that others should obtain the flocks and the camels, while ye go back to your homes with me in your midst ?"

And it is said that at these words from His lips, "tears ran down upon their beards," and they said : "Yea, Prophet of God, we are well satisfied with our share."

So much, then, He was loved ; why ? because He brought the Light to those who were in the darkness of ignorance. The testimony of His followers to what they were, and to what they had become by the teachings of the Prophet, stands on record ; we can understand what they thought of Him as Prophet, when the divine flash struck them by the teaching that He gave. They said in a petition still preserved :

We adored idols ; we lived in unchastity ; we ate dead bodies, and spoke abominations ; we disregarded every

feeling of humanity, and the duties of hospitality and neighbourhood; we knew no law but that of the strong; when God raised among us a Man, of whose birth, truthfulness, honesty and purity, we were aware; and he called us to the unity of God; and taught us not to associate anything with Him, he forbade us the worship of idols, and enjoined us to speak the truth, to be faithful to our trusts, to be merciful, and to regard the rights of our neighbours; he forbade us to speak evil of women, or to devour the substance of orphans; he ordered us to fly from vices, and to abstain from evil, to offer prayers, to render alms, to observe the fast. We have believed in him, we have accepted his teachings.

Once He had some converts from whom He took a pledge, the pledge of Akaba. As regards this pledge, remember that you are not dealing with a far-off time with no historians living, but you are dealing with the time of the seventh century, when records were well kept. See the pledge taken by these followers of the Prophet:

> We will not associate anything with God; we will not steal, nor commit adultery, nor fornication; we will not kill our children; we will abstain from calumnies and slander; we will obey the Prophet in everything that is right; and we will be faithful to Him in weal and sorrow.

Such is the pledge. The very words of the pledge speak eloquently of the condition of the people whom He raised. Judge it by those things from which they promised to abstain. Human sacrifice was common, profligacy was widespread in ordinary life. Such was the pledge that He accepted, such was the promise that He took from His followers. See how wisely adapted to the needs of the time were His moral teachings.

I leave aside till later on, as I said, the question regarding women; the question regarding toleration,

I will also deal with later on. But I want to show you here that He laid among the ignorant of His own people the firm foundation of a noble ethic. Take His teaching on charity, and see how He defined it. What is charity? One would say, giving alms, giving money to the poor. Nay, every good act is charity:

> Your smiling in your brother's face is charity; an exhortation addressed to your fellow-men to do virtuous deeds is equal to almsgiving. Putting a wanderer in the right path is charity; assisting the blind is charity; removing stones and thorns and other obstructions from the road is charity; giving water to the thirsty is charity.

So practical, so simple, are His teachings; so splendid is His definition of the duties that man owes to man. So He declares about righteousness:

> It is not righteousness that you turn your faces in prayer towards the East or the West; but righteousness is of him who believeth in God and the Last Day and the Angels, and the Scriptures, and the Prophets; who giveth money for God's sake unto his kindred, and unto orphans, and the needy, and the stranger, and those who ask, and for redemption of captives; who is constant at prayer, and giveth alms; and of those who perform their covenant when they have covenanted, and who behave themselves patiently in adversity, and in hardships, and in time of violence.

Muhammad the Prophet was an unlearned man, as the world counts learning. Over and over again He calls Himself the "illiterate Prophet," and His followers regard *Al Quran* as a standing miracle, vindicating His claim as a divine Messenger, since it is written in the most perfect Arabic. Yet, unlearned Himself, He places learning in the first rank of the things to be desired; He says:

> Acquire knowledge; for he who acquires it in the way of the Lord performs an act of piety; who

speaks of knowledge, praises God; who seeks it adores God; who dispenses instruction in it bestows alms; and who imparts it to its fitting objects performs an act of devotion to God. Knowledge enables its possessor to distinguish what is forbidden from what is not; it lights the way to heaven; it is our friend in the desert, our society in solitude, our companion when bereft of friends; it guides us to happiness; it sustains us in misery; it is our ornament in the company of friends; it serves as an armour against our enemies. With knowledge, the servant of God rises to the height of goodness and to a noble position, associates with sovereigns in this world, and attains to the perfection of happiness in the next.

So again, with a just discrimination of values, this Teacher, for whom so many died, declares:

> The ink of the scholar is more precious than the blood of the martyr.

This sentence should be emblazoned in letters of gold on the wall of every school established by Musalmans, for the children of Islam have ever rushed joyously to martyrdom, but in late centuries—things are rapidly changing now—they have honoured scholars but little.

Ali, the beloved son-in-law of the Prophet, gave a noble definition of science:

> The essence of science is the enlightenment of the heart; truth is its principal object; inspiration its guide; reason its accepter; God its inspirer; the words of man its utterer.

It was these lofty views of the value of learning which led to the philosophy of the Saracens, the science of the Moors. When it is charged against Islam that it is not progressive, that its peoples lag behind other nations in the value set on learning and

on science, its assailants, unless they ignore history, should surely seek for some other reason than the religion itself to account for the stagnation of the later days. For it was Ali, building on the foundation laid by the Prophet Himself, who began the definite teaching which, after a hundred years of quiet growth in Arabia, burst upon Europe as a splendid light and, brought by the Moors to Spain, made possible the rebirth of learning in Christendom. It was Islam which, in Arabia and Egypt, in the colleges of Baghdad and Cairo, took up the Neoplatonic heritage, despised and rejected by Christendom as "pagan," after the slaying of Hypatia, and saved its priceless riches to hand them on for European use. It was the value set on knowledge, in obedience to the Prophet's teaching, which led one branch of His followers to devote themselves to study in Arabia, while the other set out to the east and the west with the conquering sword which made Islam's mighty Empire. The students laboured unweariedly in philosophy and science while the warriors hewed their way to power, so that behind the victorious sword there ever followed the lamp of knowledge. Philosophy and science trod in the footprints left by the conqueror. First, along the north of Africa the hosts of Islam fought their way and planted their banner; then from Africa into Spain, to found there the Moorish Empire. Universities arose, and students flocked to them from all parts of Europe, for in Christendom science was unknown, astronomy and mathematics had vanished, chemistry had not risen from its Egyptian tomb. Knowledge was brought by the conquering Moors, and Pope Sylvester II, in his youth, was a student in the University of Cordova, learning the elements of geometry and mathematics, which aroused later the horror of his ignorant priesthood. I have summed

up elsewhere, in speaking on this subject, something of the science brought into Europe by the Moors:

> They take up mathematics from the Hindu and the Greek; they discover equations of the second degree; then the quadratic; then the binomial theorem; they discover the sine and cosine in trigonometry; they make the first telescope: they study the stars; they measure the size of the earth; they make a new architecture; they discover a new music; they teach scientific agriculture; they bring manufactures to the highest pitch of excellence.

Nor was all this brought to Europe only. India knows the splendid architecture of the Mughals, of whom it was justly said:

> They built like giants, and finished like jewellers.

Some of the most wonderful architectural triumphs of India are the work of the Musalmans, and India has been enriched by these treasures, poured into her lap by her Muhammadan children. Their influence may be traced also in Hindu architecture, for no art can be imprisoned within the limits of a creed or a race.

It is an interesting side-issue that much of the incurable suspicion with which official Christianity has regarded science is due to the fact that science returned to Europe under the banner of the Arabian Prophet, and was therefore regarded as a heresy; science to the orthodox was anti-Christian, and they looked on it with hatred and with horror; anyone who cares to read the epithets hurled by the Christians against the Prophet of Islam will understand that anything brought to Christendom in His name would inevitably fall under the ban of the Church. During these early centuries of the life of Islam, the

truths of science were spoken out at the risk of life, limb and liberty; the cruel expulsion of the Moors from Spain ended the long struggle and was one of the causes of the downfall of Spain from her place of pride. During these centuries also there were born to Islam some of the acutest metaphysicians and the profoundest philosophers that the world has known. They revived and carried further in Europe the philosophy which was the life of Greece, and is the Vedanta of the Hindu. In the writings of the great Doctors of Islam, the same splendid metaphysic is found which is the glory of the Vedanta, and here lies one of the reasons for union between Hindus and Musalmans in modern India. Islam and Hinduism can meet each other, and clasp hands in brotherly friendship on this high ground of philosophy and metaphysic, common to both, Musalman Doctors and Hindu Acharyas standing side by side. And here may I say a word of gentle reproach to my brothers of Islam?—"This metaphysic is yours, but it is of value for the world; why do you not translate it for the benefit of India and of the West?" When I wanted to study it, I found it in Arabic, or in the monkish Latin of the Middle Ages; finally I discovered some fragmentary translations in French—the French apparently valuing these treasures of Islam more than their legitimate owners—and found myself on familiar ground, so close was their philosophy to that of the Hindus. By the translation of these works a point of union, then, would be found between Musalmans and Hindus, and they would find themselves at one in philosophy and metaphysic while differing in rites. And secondly, such translations would vindicate Islam in the eyes of the world, as translations of the Acharyas have vindicated Hinduism. Europe will recognise and honour the

Muhammadan learning of the East, and we shall hear no more of the reproach that Islam favours ignorance.

Let us consider next the attitude of Islam towards women. One of the commonest sneers at Islam in the West is that it teaches that women have no souls. This is most certainly false. *Al Quran* says:

> Whoso doeth evil shall be rewarded for it, and shall not find any patron or helper beside God; but whoso doeth good works, whether he be male or female, and is a true believer, he shall be admitted into paradise and shall not in the least be unjustly dealt with. . . . True believers of either sex, and the devout men and the devout women, and the men of veracity and the women of veracity, and the patient men and patient women, and the humble men and the humble women, and the alms-givers of either sex and the men who fast and the women who fast, and the chaste men and the chaste women, and those of either sex who remember God frequently; for them hath God prepared forgiveness and a great reward. . . . I will not suffer the work of him among you who worketh to be lost, whether he be male or female. The one of you is from the other.

Men and women are thus put on a perfectly equal footing in matters of religion.

But, it is said, Islam allows polygamy. That is so. But in justice to Islam two facts should be considered: first, the historical. The people for whose uplifting Islam was given were living, to a very large extent, in promiscuity; sex morality had no existence among them: to command them to observe monogamy would have been useless; only gradual reform was possible. Hence the Prophet, being wise and far-seeing, first laid down, as a limitation of promiscuity, that a man might have four wives only; then, gradually to eliminate polygamy, that a husband might only take a second

wife if he could treat her in all respects as the first. His teaching is working towards the result aimed at, and educated Musalmans—at least in India, of other lands I cannot speak—are rising out of polygamy.

The second fact is the present relation between men and women in all "civilised" countries. The true and righteous sex-relation between one man and one woman is preached as an ideal in some countries, but is generally practised in none. Islam permits polygamy; Christendom forbids but winks at it, provided that no *legal* tie exists with more than one. There is pretended monogamy in the West, but there is really polygamy without responsibility; the "mistress" is cast off when the man is weary of her, and sinks gradually to be the "woman of the streets," for the first lover has no responsibility for her future, and she is a hundred times worse off than the sheltered wife and mother in the polygamous home. When we see the thousands of miserable women who crowd the streets of Western towns during the night, we must surely feel that it does not lie in Western mouth to reproach Islam for its polygamy. It is better for a woman, happier for a woman, more respectable for a woman, to live in Muhammadan polygamy, united to one man only, with the legitimate child in her arms, and surrounded with respect, than to be seduced, cast out into the streets—perhaps with an illegitimate child outside the pale of law—unsheltered and uncared for, to become the victim of any passer-by, night after night, rendered incapable of motherhood, despised of all. It is good for Society that monogamy should be held up as an ideal, for its public recognition as right and the inner shame connected with resort to prostitution are purifying forces; but monogamy is not practised where there is one legal wife and hidden non-legalised sexual relations. The

recognised polygamy of the East degrades the social conscience more than the unrecognised polygamy of the West—"hypocrisy is a homage vice pays to virtue"—but the happiness and dignity of the woman suffer less under the first than under the second.

Apart from this, Musalman women have been far better treated than Western women by the law. Until lately English law, for instance, confiscated the married woman's property as though marriage were a felony, forfeited her earnings, gave her no claim to her own children. By the laws of Islam her property was carefully guarded. And it is noteworthy how great a part women have played in Muslim countries as rulers, and in statesmanship.

"But Islam is a persecuting faith, a religion of the sword." Alas! most faiths must confess to persecution and bloodshed. The followers of Islam have wrested the teachings of their Prophet as other faiths have done, and there are no teachings of persecution in *Al Quran* so cruel as those in the Old Testament, still declared by Christian Churches to be the "Word of God," though no longer obeyed. The Prophet Muhammad constantly declares that there is but one religion, Islam. But Islam in His mouth only means surrender to the Divine Will, and He calls all holy men of old, men who lived long before His time, followers of Islam. Surrender to the Divine Will is recognised by every religionist as a duty, and Islam *as used by the Prophet*, has this inclusive meaning; in this sense every true faith is Islam, and every one who surrenders his will to God is a true follower of Islam. Once more listen to *Al Quran*:

There is no distinction between Prophets. . . . Every one of the Prophets believed in God, His angels and His scriptures and His apostles. We make no distinction

at all between His apostles. . . . Say, we believe in God and that which hath been sent down unto us, and that which was sent down unto Abraham and Ismail and Isaac and Jacob and other tribes, and that which was delivered to Moses and Jesus and the Prophets from their Lord; we make no distinction between any of them. . . . They who believe in God and His apostles and make no distinction between any of them, unto those will we give their reward; and God is gracious and merciful.

It is true that He commanded: "Slay the infidels." But He defines the infidels as those who do not follow righteousness. There are two sets of these commands: "Slay the infidels"; and: "Slay the infidel when he attacks you, and will not let you practise your religion." It has been authoritatively ruled by Muhammadan jurists that when there is an absolute and a conditioned command, the latter must be taken as defining and limiting the former. Moreover the Prophet lays down with regard to infidels:

If they desist from opposing thee, what is already past shall be forgiven them.

And He says:

Invite men unto the way of the Lord by wisdom and mild exhortation; and dispute with them in the most condescending manner, for the Lord well knoweth him who strayeth from His path, and He well knoweth those who are rightly directed. Let there be no violence in religion. If they embrace Islam they are surely directed; but if they turn their backs, verily unto thee belongeth preaching only.

Nor should it be forgotten that some of the exhortations, now interpreted as universal, were really addressed by the Prophet, as a General, to troops just going into battle, often against overwhelming odds, and were intended to rouse

them to courage in the impending fight. His practice may be taken, surely, as a commentary on His precepts; and we find that He stopped the universal practice of killing prisoners taken in battle, and taught His soldiers to treat their captured foes with the utmost kindness.

Further, we read that even controversy was not to be harsh and bitter.

> Revile not the idols which they invoke beside God, lest they maliciously revile God without knowledge. . . . Unto every one of you have we given a law and an open path; and if God had pleased He had surely made you one people. But He hath thought fit to give you different laws, that He might try you in that which He hath given you respectively. Therefore strive to excel each other in good works; unto God shall ye all return, and then will He declare unto you that concerning which ye have disagreed.

In speaking thus I have had a purpose beyond that of amusing you for an hour by repeating things that many of you must know as well as, or better than, I. And that purpose is the drawing together of Musalmans and Hindus, for India can never become a nation until Hindus, Zoroastrians, Christians and Musalmans understand each other. Shall we not all put aside theological hatreds and feel as brothers? Shall not the Musalman cease to mutter "Giaour," and the Hindu cease to whisper "Mlechchha," and the Christian cease to say "Heathen"? Shall we not learn to respect each other's faith, and reverence each other's worship? There is no need for conversion from one religion to another; each is a Ray of the Sun of Truth. We must all return to the home whence we came, and we may well live with our minds at peace in the

land in which we must physically dwell side by side. None need give up aught that is dear to him, that has been handed down by generations of his ancestors, that is the centre round which cluster the sanctities of home. Each should not only love his faith, but also live it, and realise that his neighbour's faith is as precious to his neighbour as his own is precious to himself. Let us learn from our neighbours instead of quarrelling with them, love them instead of hating, respect them instead of scorning. It is written: "All shall return to God." It is written: "All shall perish save His Face." Call Him Allah, call him Jehovah, call Him Ahura-mazda, call Him Ishvara—names are many, but He is One. We see the Sun from different places, but He stands the same unchanging Light in heaven, shining on all alike. We are all children of one Father; why should we quarrel on the journey home?

THE WORK OF THE THEOSOPHICAL SOCIETY IN INDIA[1]

DURING the time when the duties of the office conferred upon me, that of President of the Theosophical Society, carried me far away to foreign lands, a good many attacks were made, some upon the Theosophical Society as a whole, some upon the Central Hindu College, as being inseparable from that Society, and with these, naturally, a good many attacks upon myself. With regard to these latter personal attacks, I do not propose to say anything at all. Personal controversy is always undesirable, and controversy is more likely to die if there is only one side to it—if I may say what is rather an Irish bull—than if both sides are present assailing each other. But wherever the Theosophical Society is concerned, and wherever the Central Hindu College is concerned, there most surely is it my duty to make defence against attack, for duties are manifold and according to the position is the duty; the old lesson of Dharma connects together the duty and the place. Therefore, as President of the Theosophical Society, as President also of the Board of Trustees of the Central Hindu College, it would not be right that I should leave unanswered the attacks that may injure the first, and in injuring the first, also undermine the second. For the Theosophical Society in India and the Central Hindu College have much work to do in the future of

[1] The closing lecture of the Theosophical Convention of 1909.

the land. As both have helped—as I shall show you—to lay the foundation of the great movement which is beginning to-day to build India into a nation, so in the days to come each has a part to play, and that part will be played less effectively if untrue statements are allowed to circulate uncontradicted, statements which have no justification either in principle or in fact.

Let us then consider what is the work of the Theosophical Society, and first, though in a few sentences only, as regards the world at large; I have to-day rather to speak of its work in India than of the duty that may elsewhere fall to its share.

The general duties of the Theosophical Society in the whole world are well marked and clear.

I. To endeavour to bring about the recognition of a Universal Brotherhood, wherein the difference of sex and race, of caste and colour and creed, shall be seen as the trifling and transitory things they are, as compared with the spiritual and lasting Brotherhood which is based upon the identity in all of the Universal Self, sexless, endless, without colour, caste or race. The eternal Self embodies itself in endless varied modifications. The stone and the deva, the tree and the man, the animal and the savage, all these are but transient phenomena of the ever-living, ever-manifesting Self; and as that Self is recognised in every land, in all conditions, and under all circumstances, then and then alone will come the recognition of the Universal Brotherhood which excludes none from its pale. And in order that that great object may be served, it is the duty of the Society in every land to revive spirituality, to restore to every faith anything that in the lapse of time it may have lost or allowed to have become covered up on account of the

ignorance of its believers; to carry to every country spirituality in the garb of its own religion, not being wiser than the Great Ones who have given different religions to men for the helping of different temperaments and types; working in the service of every religion; not proselytising, no more trying to make the Buddhist or the Hindu a Christian than to make the Christian a Hindu or a Buddhist; regarding every religion as holy, as a path to the Supreme, and humbly trying to serve the eternal verities of the spiritual life, on the knowledge of which rests the destiny of man.

II. In order that it may do this, it studies all religions to show their essential unity, and thus establish peace between them. They differ in their garments, not in their life. We compare their doctrines to demonstrate the unity of their origin. The more men of all faiths know of the faiths of others, the more will they realise the religious Brotherhood of Man.

III. It asserts the reality of the superphysical and revives the knowledge of it; as it proves the unity of all faiths, so does it seek to justify the rites of each by showing the reality of the superphysical, for by these rites is built the bridge between this world and the worlds that lie beyond. The Society is the same in every nation; climate does not touch it, languages do not alter it, but it brings to each religion anything it may have lost by the flux of time. It carries the same message of spirituality everywhere in the world, but uses the language of each faith in order to help those of the faith with which it is dealing.

So far our work is clear. The only opponents will be among the more bigoted, the more narrow, the

more ignorant of every faith. The more liberal, whether Hindu, Christian, Buddhist, Zoroastrian, Hebrew, Sikh, or Jaina, will all recognise that this is good work; but the narrow, the fanatical, those who declare that only by *their* road may man reach God, those who claim the Universal Self as the particular property of their own religion, will dislike the Theosophical Society and try to hinder its work. We leave them on one side, until they learn the wider wisdom. Yet fanaticism is better than indifference, for the fanatic of one life may become the martyr or hero of the next.

But let us turn to this great land of India, in the present and the future of which every one of us is so strongly interested. Let us glance at India as she was when the Theosophical Society came to her; let us see whether the Theosophical Society has not had a large share in bringing about the change in India that we see on every side to-day; for this, after all, is the point of immediate interest to raise, and it is this on which explanation and defence are needed.

Now the Theosophical Society in India consists of some five thousand men and women scattered over the country in something less than three hundred Branches or Lodges. Almost the whole of that membership is made up of English-educated men and women. We have scarcely touched the masses of the people, and in truth our work lies more with the educated; for the religions can deal with the uneducated, if the advanced classes be enlightened and spiritual. Better to work among those who influence the masses, than in the masses themselves, as regards reformation and change. Changes should always begin above and work downwards; then they influence powerfully and healthily; but changes which begin in the masses tend to bring

about revolutions rather than reforms. This is a small number you may say, in comparison with the population, though large regarded by itself. But it is an organised body, and that adds enormously to its power. A very small body of disciplined people is far more effective and powerful than a vast mob of the undisciplined; and each group of these five thousand people is surrounded by a great mass of sympathisers who work with them everywhere and strengthen their power enormously, whether you think it wielded for good or harm.

So India has within her borders an organised mass of her own sons and daughters gathered under the banner of the Theosophical Society. The majority of them in India, naturally, are Hindus; in Ceylon and Burma there is a fair number of the daughter faith of Buddhism; there is a very considerable number among the Parsis; very few in the great faith of Islam, and that is one reason why the gulf yawns so widely between the Hindu and Muhammadan populations. If we could only win a few hundreds in Islam to become members of the Theosophical Society, a bridge would be thrown across the gulf which threatens to grow wider and wider, the gulf which is fatal to the unity of the nation, an obstacle to advancement in the future. This body of men and women then, with a few Christians also, and a sprinkling of the descendants of Abraham, our Hebrew brothers, a fair number of Sikhs, and not so many of the Jainas—this makes up the composition of the Theosophical Society in India. The European element also enters into it—a handful in the great mass of Eastern-born bodies.

Now against the Theosophical Society two accusations are made; first that it tends to revive superstition, and secondly that the Hindu Theosophists are

encouraged in inertia, laziness and sloth. It is said in an article in the *Hindustan Review*: "What does 'Theosophy' stand for in the new life of India? It stands for orthodoxy, for reaction, for inactivity, for sheer inertia." The writer is a "Pandit," but apparently identifies religion and superstition. He says that the Central Hindu College, the main object of his attack, "stands identified with 'Theosophy'".

I quite agree in this last point, and will deal presently with the nature of that identification.

But let us compare the statement as to Theosophy standing for inertia with the fact. When Mme. H. P. Blavatsky and Col. H. S. Olcott, the earthly founders of the Theosophical Society, first set foot on Indian soil, what was the condition of India and of Hinduism? Scepticism and materialism had eaten out the life of the nation. The crowds of the so-called English-educated class were followers of Huxley, Mill and Spencer, and had entirely forgotten their own literature; were contemptuous of the past and hence hopeless for the future; they were copying English ways, English manners, filling their houses with English furniture to the destruction of Indian arts and crafts. They had lost all national spirit.

De-spiritualisation had brought about national degeneracy. There was no activity of national life, no pulsing of the national heart. Read the papers of the day and judge for yourselves. Even when I came to India, Indians told me that India was dead; they smiled sadly at my statement that India was not dead, but sleeping. She is not sleeping to-day.

In those past days of sleep accusations many and various were levelled against the founders of the Theosophical Society. They were suspected by the

Government, because they accepted Indians with the social courtesies shown to equals, because they did not pay proper attention to distinctions of colour, because they were trying to make the people proud of their ancient philosophy, were trying to make them aspire to ancient ideals. Everywhere the police dogged their steps and took down the Colonel's lectures, until at last the Colonel indignantly remonstrated; and not until after a most humiliating justification on the part of each of them—showing their respective ranks in the countries they had quitted—were the police removed from their track, at least openly, and they were permitted to travel undogged by spies over India. At least at that time the Government theory was not that they were likely to increase Indian inertia.

Realising that spirituality must first be restored to its place in life, they began by the revival of religions. There was then no national life, no Congress, no Industrial Exhibitions, no idea of the unity of the Indian people. These things the young men have grown up amongst, not knowing whence they came; but among the elder generation not one of these activities was known. Colonel Olcott and Madame Blavatsky saw that not until India recognised the value of its ancient faith could there be any bond of unity among the Indians, separated by provincial jealousies and hatreds. So they began with the revival of religion; they pointed out the value of Hindu teachings; they held up the Vedas and the Upanishads as the glory of India, proclaimed the value of Indian thought and the priceless heritage of the Indian people; until at last the Indians began once more to pride themselves on their past, and to realise that the Hindu Scriptures were not the babblings of children or the fancies of savages, but

were the foundation of a mighty system, the glory of the past and the life of the future.

Both the Founders joined Buddhism, because it was the only Eastern religion that would accept them, and they wanted to emphasise the value of Eastern religion. Buddhism offers an open door to those who desire to come, and Colonel Olcott, with his leanings of the past to Buddhism, went into it heart and soul, Madame Blavatsky's joining was of a more superficial character. I once asked her why she had joined Buddhism, and she answered: "Well, my dear, I wanted to show that I thought a religion of the East was rather better than the religion of the West." This reason was quite enough for, and quite characteristic of, Madame Blavatsky. She was above all exoteric religions and valued them as far as they were true, rejecting all that ignorance had added. She became nominally a Buddhist and took Pansil. And so that great protest in favour of the superiority in spirituality of the East was made. With what result? With the result that everywhere this revival of the religions of the East began to spread; Boys' Associations were formed by Colonel Olcott all over the land, in which the boys were helped to study their ancient faith and were taught to love and feel pride in their Motherland. There were no cries of "Vande Mataram" in those days. The idea of a Motherland was new, and the time had not yet come. There were none to help, so that religious and moral education might be introduced into the schools. And so these Boys' Associations were formed; the elders were told that they were already spoiled, but that the young ones might grow up properly. And we can see the difference between them and the fathers from whom they sprang. Zoroastrianism began to throw off some of the shackles of its materialistic

thought; Buddhism changed its character. A missionary lately complained that whereas formerly when a Buddhist of Ceylon was asked his religion in court he hung down his head and whispered, "Buddhism," he now holds up his head and says proudly: "I am a Buddhist"; and he complained that this was the result of the work of the Theosophical Society in Ceylon. Gradually in that ancient Buddhist country the leaven of Theosophy has worked in transforming the inert into the active, not the active into the inert. When the Theosophical Society went there Government and missionary schools alone existed. Now more than two hundred and twenty schools and three colleges are under Buddhist control, filled with Buddhist children who learn to reverence the Lord Buddha and to keep the precepts of the Faith. Before Theosophy went there that Buddhist country was becoming a drunken country, and much of the revenue was drawn from drink. With the revival of Buddhism by the Theosophical Society and the constant repetition of the statement in the Pansil that no intoxicating liquor might be taken, came the revival of temperance in Ceylon, until the authorities complained that they would have to find some new way of raising the money hitherto drawn from the excise.

Now how far, think you, would this revival of religion—which is everywhere granted as the work of the Theosophical Society—tend to superstition? Are religion and superstition identical? If so, then Theosophy must plead guilty to reviving superstition. But we Theosophists strenuously deny this identity, and we proclaim religion—man's search for God—as the one sure foundation for national prosperity and stability, while superstition and scepticism are alike the foes of religion, born in ignorance and alike

destructive to national life. Unless all history be false, religion has ever dominated the rise and strength of a civilisation, while scepticism has ever been the sign of its coming decay. The unity of the Self is the basis of religion and of morality; when this is forgotten, the warring selves tear society into pieces. Superstition, substituting the non-essential for the essential, grows strong with the decay of religion; in vain it is assailed, in vain it is denounced, while the realities it masks are hidden. Superstition can only be destroyed by knowledge, not by abuse. Theosophy gave the knowledge. It laid stress on the things in religion which were based on natural laws, and so justified very often some old custom that otherwise would have died away. But in doing this, it has only anticipated Western science. Europe is re-discovering some of these very laws, and scientific men are beginning to insist on the careful rules of hygiene and sanitation that our Manu had taught thousands of years ago. The trifling things that cannot be justified fall away, but the customs based on natural laws begin to revive. Some modern Hindus, not knowing either the ancient scriptures or modern science, scoff at these observances. Why, they say, insist on the Brahmanic superstition that the Brahmana alone should draw water from the village well, and pour it into the village pots brought for filling? And yet an English Inspector travelling through these Provinces said that the custom checked disease, for you could take care of the one vessel and see that it was clean, whereas if any vessel, brought perhaps from a dirty house, were dipped into the well, the water would be made foul, disease would spread, and health be injured. It is silly to throw away these hygienic rules when Europe is re-discovering them. I know only one man in the West who is as careful as a Brahmana, and he is a doctor. He

washes his hands before he eats, and when asked the reason, he answers: "Microbes." Such rules of caring for food-vessels are not superstition; they are good hygiene; we have been blamed for justifying them, but the more you disregard them the more disease will spread. And so with many other customs and ceremonies, called superstitions by the ignorant.

I am, however, willing to grant that wherever there is a revival of religion there will be some recrudescence of superstition. So in re-lighting a smouldering fire, there will be some smoke. But the remedy for the smoke is to blow the fire into flame; then the smoke will vanish and the fire will burn bright and clear. As Theosophy spreads, the smoke of superstition will vanish, and the fire of knowledge will blaze up. But if you refuse knowledge, the smoke will continue, for men would rather have a smoky fire than none.

Let us now consider more closely this question of inertia. There is rather a long list of the ways in which Hindu Theosophists have demonstrated their inertia, their sloth, their inaction! To begin: the first Industrial Exhibition was held in Bombay at an early Convention of the Theosophical Society, on the initiative of Colonel Olcott. Until the nation knew what it could produce, it was not possible to revive the national prosperity—so Colonel Olcott said. Hence he gathered together Indian products, and placed them in a house in which they might be seen; and that first Industrial Exhibition was the parent of the Exhibitions now so popular all over India. The National Congress was founded by English and Indian Theosophists, working hand-in-hand. The first meeting which suggested it was held at a Convention of the Theosophical Society at Adyar; it was under the shelter of the banner of Theosophy, when Mr. Hume and others, Indian Theosophists, were present,

that the National Congress took birth. And in those early days its life came from the inert members of the Theosophical Society! It was the Hindu Theosophists who worked in the early days before the Congress was popular. Later, it grew popular and strong, but it ought not to forget the days of its infancy, when it was cradled and nursed in the Theosophical Society, until it was able to stand and run alone. And as regards the Swadeshi Movement: the Colonel preached it and I preached it when it was very unpopular; and when everybody laughed at us, saying: "You will never get the people of this country to care." To princes and people I preached it wherever I went, and always from the economic standpoint. It had then no echo in Bengal. It was not until the lash fell upon them in the Partition of Bengal that Bengalis—the most Anglicised of all the Indian peoples—were stirred into activity and the Swadeshi movement, as a political weapon rather than an economic reform, was triumphantly proclaimed everywhere. But some of us, who are older and within the pale of Theosophy, remember how the seed was sown. While we admire the vigour of to-day, we do not see why the poor Theosophist should be shut out. So of that third great movement also you find the beginning in the inert Hindu Theosophists!

Then we come to the depressed classes. I cannot help remembering that outside the missionary work—and they did it more to attack Hinduism—that schools for the depressed Pariahs were founded round the Theosophical Headquarters at Adyar by Colonel Olcott, and that it was Theosophists who laboured there in order to make that education a success. Now, India is waking up to her duty to the oppressed, but this fourth great movement of the day was worked at

patiently for years, before it became popular, by the members of the Theosophical Society.

Pass from this, and look at the work of temperance in India. I know that it is a disgrace that this work should be necessary, and that it has become a necessity largely from the example set by Westerners. But it is an Indian Theosophist, Dr. Edal-Behram—whose name in Surat is a symbol of self-sacrifice—who has led in Gujerat the great Temperance Crusade. Thousands of people who ate flesh and drank alcohol—the two go together—have been rescued. The initiative, as ever, came from the Theosophical impulse, and others have joined to follow where it has taken the lead.

Take the question of child-marriage. Here again, Hindu Theosophists have been much more ready to take up a reform and *carry it out* than their critics. It is many years since we formed a league within the E.S.—attacked by those who know nothing about it—and took down the names of fathers who took a pledge not to marry their daughters until two or three years later than their caste custom demanded. They ask here, in the *Hindustan Review*, whether the Central Hindu College will give men who are physically robust. You will never have robust men with boy-fathers and girl-mothers, and if you want strong men you must let your boys and girls grow up into reasonable maturity before you put upon them the burden of bringing children into the world. And the Central Hindu College is the only institution, so far, that has dared to refuse married boys up to the eighth class in the school, and has asked for a pledge from the father not to marry the boy until he reaches the ninth class.[1]

[1] The Board has just closed the upper school classes also to married boys, and has imposed double fees on married college students in the first and second year from July 1910.

If those who attack us would do the same! If instead of assailing us they would imitate us, this great curse would be more rapidly removed from India. They have not attacked it as a defection from the Hindu religion. We have shown that the marriage of a student is against the Laws of Manu, who imposed celibacy on the student. If we had brought arguments from Spencer instead of from Manu, perhaps they would have approved of us! At any rate the inert Hindu Theosophists have taken the lead in this great practical reform—the sixth—and have worked at it everywhere, until now there is a very general cry in its favour. It has been among Theosophists that men have been found to face the social odium of delaying the marriage of their children, who have not shrunk, in the words of our critic, "from braving the pain of new ideas".

With regard to girls' education, a seventh movement: we have not enough schools, but we have some; and how many girls' schools have been opened by our critics? I know only of one body which is energetic in this field, and that is the Arya Samaj; they have done all they could in favour of girls' education; but outside I do not see any other bodies who are working so hard, and I find Hindu Theosophists all over the country opening girls' schools and leading the way, as they have done in so many other cases, despite their inertia.

Now as regards religious and moral education, the Central Hindu College is the most m[illegible] in which Theosophists have been working, and as said by one of our critics: "You cannot disguise from yourself the fact that the Central Hindu College stands identified with Theosophy". I accept the fact. On this matter, some of our critics say we are too orthodox; that is the idea of the *Hindustan*

Review article; the other side says we are not orthodox enough, and should put an orthodox Hindu in the place of Mr. Arundale. I do not know which of these I ought to answer; perhaps I may be permitted to leave them to answer each other. But I may perhaps say, in passing, that you could not have any more orthodox Hindu than Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Adityaram Bhattacharya—an inert Theosophist! I should add—who was there as the Honorary Acting Principal of the College so long as his health permitted, and on his finding the work too heavy at his advanced age, we asked him to take the post of Rector, so that he might still have a strong influence and voice in the conduct of the College. And if you can find another good Hindu as capable and as willing to sacrifice himself as the present English Principal, I think I could find other work for my friend George Arundale. Other proofs of Theosophical inertia are the religious examinations in several great centres; I have given prizes for religion in Bombay in which hundreds of boys and girls have been taught and examined by Hindu Theosophists, who had given both money and time. I do not find that other bodies are willing to give the same money and time. But our inert Theosophists are constantly busy along these lines, trying to do the work while others talk about it. And then we have a number of affiliated schools. There is the great school in Alleppey; and the College in Kashmir is another due to Theosophical initiative. There are textbooks issued by the Central Hindu College giving, for the first time in Hindu history, a short, clear outline of Hinduism, so that the boys and girls may understand their religion—and the books have been adopted by State after State, and school after school. What right have those to criticise, who have nothing to show against these many works of

the Hindu Theosophists? Another point as to our College: it is Theosophists, both English and Hindu, who have supplied the strong staff of honorary workers which enables us, despite the pressure put upon us, to keep down the fees. Who was the first Honorary Superintendent of the boarding-house? Pandit Chheda Lal, an old Theosophist. And who followed him? Babu Rameshwar Prasad, another Theosophist. Who was the first Honorary Principal? An English Theosophist—Dr. Arthur Richardson, who has lost health and strength in the loving service given to the College. Who is helping us, by Honorary Professorships, to keep the College an Indian one? Professor Telang—a son of the late Mr. Justice Telang—a Hindu Theosophist; and Professor Dalal, a well known Bombay chemist, also a Hindu Theosophist; and Rai Iqbal Narain Gurtu, our Honorary Headmaster; he indeed came to us without being a member, but he has joined the Society since, appreciating the value of the work that we have been doing. And it is the same with our honorary office-workers, who do daily drudgery: Babu Bhagavan Das, Babu Jnanendranath Basu, Babu Kali Charan Mitra, all Hindu Theosophists. I might take name after name of Hindu Theosophists —leaving out our English Theosophical workers— who have given up money, health, time and life to the work. I think that *their* work, at least, might be respected by their countrymen, until Hindu non-Theosophists can show a similar roll of honorary workers for their Motherland.

But why *any* English? Why not? The proof lies with the people who attack us for serving India, not with us. Love needs no defence; only hatred needs to be excused; the gulf between nation and nation, the antagonism between people and people, these

need justification, and not the loving service freely given. And before I tell you—answering an unnecessary question—why there should be some English working among you, let me suggest that such an article as that in the *Modern Review*, entitled "The Social Conquest of the Hindu Race," can but bring fresh fruits of sorrow, new waves of hatred from those on either side who prefer hatred and isolation to love and brotherhood. It is said that if the English work with the Indian it is on an unequal footing, and that "all the positions of trust, responsibility and social leadership are occupied by Englishmen and Englishwomen". Certainly that is not true in the Central Hindu College, nor within the limits of the Theosophical Society. In order to make that accusation apparently stand on a groundwork of fact, a statement is made as to some pretended "Executive Committee" in 1906, but I cannot find any justification for it in our Annual Report for that year—or any other. To say that "there is no Hindu occupying an important office on the Executive Committee" is only true because there is no Executive Committee! On the Managing Committee I am the *only* non-Indian in office. I find that Mr. Arundale worked under a Hindu, Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Adityaram Bhattacharya, without any trouble. English ladies now work under a Hindu Headmaster, Pandit Iqbal Narain Gurtu, without the least trouble. Now that Mr. Arundale is Principal, a position he has won by good service and the love of his colleagues, I find that there is not one of his countrymen to be a second Englishman in the College. It is a little hard in some ways, that we have to resist pressure which would force us to engage other Englishmen in this College, and at the same time are attacked by some of our Indian brothers because there is *one*

Englishman on our staff. Mr. Arundale was the one man who came forward to work without a salary as Principal, with the necessary capacity and the necessary University degree, when Dr. Richardson had finally broken down, and Pandit Adityaram withdrew because of age. If anyone cares to read our reports he will find Indians and English mixed up without reference to race. Even in the Athletic Association, where we might very well expect Englishmen to predominate, as the games are English, I find in this report of 1906 that the President was Mr. D. Kini, the General Secretary, Babu Kali Das Manik; Mr. A. W. Collie was the Cricket Secretary, Babu Brij Lal Prasad was the Football Secretary, and Mr. Arundale the Hockey Secretary. The names are on a footing of absolute equality, with an Indian at the head. As regards the Governing Body, I myself have been President and Chairman, because sometimes it needs an English mouth to speak out plainly. My colleague in all these long years has been Babu Upendra Nath Basu as Vice-President and Vice-Chairman, and he takes my place during my long absences. The Secretary of the Board at the beginning was Babu Govinda Das. When he had to give it up, owing to ill-health, his brother Bhagavan Das resigned Government Service to take up the Honorary Secretaryship, as well as being first Honorary Assistant Secretary, and then Honorary Secretary to the Managing Committee, and bearing the drudgery of the office work.

It may be an invidious and ungracious thing to point to all these facts, which anyone can verify, in answer to the falsehoods circulated in order to stir up strife and prevent co-operation between two nations brought together by Providence in this Indian land. But what can one do against the false

but speak the true, when the false means ruin and the truth means peace?

For surely it cannot be well to circulate fabrications of this kind. To what end can they bring us? And what purpose can they serve? Let me put to you what seems to me to be the really serious matter regarding the whole of this; it means, if successful, the stirring up of strife, the rending of India, the explosion of war. I ask you why the English should not work with their Indian brothers? Why page after page in an important Review—admirably conducted save for its wild hatred of the English—should be filled with incitements to strife? Why should every Englishman who has tried to serve India be insulted, forgetting that in the changes which have made modern India, English and Indian have worked hand in hand? Is there any reason for this suspicion and this hatred? There is a justification, and that we, who wear English bodies, should never forget under any insult. I who wear an English body have a right to say so. There is a justification for our Indian fellow-subjects regarding the English people with suspicion, and even, perhaps, with hatred. There was so much of evil and of wrong, so much of treacherous betrayal and barbarous treatment in the past, that Indians may well suspect and hate. The memories of Clive, of Warren Hastings, and of many another have cast a dark shadow of suspicion over many and many an Indian heart. Let Macaulay bear witness, who has written the story in deathless prose. When I see suspicions rise, and read words of hatred such as these I read in this article, I say to myself: "Alas! the memory of wrong still remains, and the only way to root it out is the way of loving service, of quiet acceptance of now wrongful suspicion, until hatred is worn out by love." "Hatred ceaseth not by hatred at

any time; hatred ceaseth by love." And will not you, my Indian brothers, allow the few of us in English bodies, who have given to the Motherland our love, our work and our devotion, who have for her sake forsaken the country of our birth and the friends we have left behind, will you not allow us to pour out our love at India's feet, and to give the service we count it honour and privilege to render? Will you not let us make amends for the wrongs of the past? We will bear the karma of our country; we will bear the suspicion; we will bear the hatred; and we will pay you back only in love and service. Even if at the bottom of your hearts you do not trust us, even if you wrongly think that we have some ulterior motive, some personal aim, yet, for the sake of India's future, for the sake of the children of the future, who should work hand in hand and not in ever-perpetuated hatred and mutual wrong, forgive us what is wrong in the past of our countrymen, take us as willing offerings to make amends for the wrong. Do not drive us away until you have others to replace us; but let us work in love and harmony, and let us help you towards that self-government, which can only come by English and Indians working hand in hand for the coming future and the Motherland, to make the common tie which shall bind these countries into one for evermore.

THE VALUE OF THEOSOPHY IN THE RAISING OF INDIA[1]

MANY of you know that the value of Theosophy with regard to the raising of India has been a matter that has been largely discussed, that has been challenged by many; you will find that many say that the Theosophical propaganda has tended to bring back old superstition, and has also tended to turn men's minds away from the more practical affairs of life, and to withdraw some of the brightest intelligences from the pressing problems of the day. These criticisms come from men who, by their intelligence, their patriotism, their desire to serve their country, are worthy of the greatest respect and consideration. I have therefore thought it desirable to deal with this subject, in order that, if possible, I may show to you that the criticism is based on a mistake, that the challenge is one which may readily be answered. I shall try to show you this, partly by an appeal to history, partly by pointing out the condition of things in the present day as they are open to observation, partly by appealing to your intelligence as to the natural, inevitable consequences of events. I shall try to show you that Theosophy is following the best and the wisest methods for the permanent elevation of the country, and is really employing the most direct of all ways of dealing with the general distress, with the general condition of this land.

[1] A lecture, first printed in 1904.

First, let me deal for a moment with the accusation that the tendency of the Theosophic propaganda is to revive ancient superstitions. Much that was a few years ago regarded as superstition is now being re-established by modern science, and modern science is doing more in this way than is Theosophy. But I am prepared at once to say that, whenever there is revival of religions there must also be to some extent the revival of ancient superstition; and the revival of religion has, it is admitted on all hands, accompanied the work of the Theosophical Society. It is not only the friends of Theosophy but also its opponents and those who are neutral who admit that, wherever Theosophy goes, a revival of religion follows; and that has been the case in India, where the most ancient of the religions of this land has shown, during the last twenty years, the most marked increase of vigour, of increased strength, of strenuous life. I say, I am prepared to admit that wherever such a revival takes place there will be, to some extent, a revival of superstition. I am prepared to admit that the impulse of spiritual life poured out into a nation will have some eddies and backwaters, which bring life again to the dying seeds of superstition. Is it not written that every undertaking is surrounded by evil as fire is surrounded by smoke? In a world as imperfect as the present, can any undertaking be productive of nothing but good? Imperfection must necessarily accompany the good; the smoke must go with the fire. But if you are wise, when there is much smoke with a fire, you do not try to extinguish the fire and remain in the cold, but you try to make the fire burn more brightly in order that the smoke may disappear. You find that superstition accompanies the revival of religion; the way to escape it is not to go back to the cold chill of materialism, but to spread the knowledge which

will cut away scepticism on the one side and superstition on the other with the sword of wisdom. That is the way of the wise, that is the remedy for ignorance. It is true that the advent of true spiritual teachers will be utilised by the false teachers for their own gain and for their own advantage. Admitting that with the increase of spirituality its dark sister superstition will for a while hold up her head, I say to you that the increase of religion is the way to destroy superstition, and that you must deal with it in the way of the wise and not in the way of the foolish. The modern spirit of science stimulates research in every direction. It is by asking nature of her secrets that the advance of science is made. Is that an unmixed good? What of the great crime of modern science, one of the most ghastly crimes against nature—vivisection? That comes from the anxiety to have knowledge, to find out the truth about nature. Would you give up modern science because of the crime of the vivisectionists? Or would you keep science and rouse the conscience of men, and so prevent the evil?

Take the second accusation, that we are not practical, that we turn men's minds away from political, social, commercial questions, and so lead much of the intelligence of the nation away from the questions on which the salvation of the nation depends. I put it to you that that is the most practical of methods which goes to the root of the ills from which the nation suffers, and not that which deals only with the superficial results and leaves the root untouched. The truly practical gardener is not the man who goes about the garden cutting off the heads of the weeds and making a temporary clearance, while he leaves underground the roots of the weeds, which presently will send out fresh

shoots and cover the garden again. The practical gardener is the man who roots up the weeds, so that in the future they shall not sprout again. And the fault, the error, of most modern politicians is that they deal with results and not with causes, they deal with effects and not with the underlying roots; and the outcome is that the evils come up again and again and again, in never-ceasing succession, and humanity wearies itself century after century cutting off the hydra heads of evils that grow again as often as each head is cut down.

Now Theosophy goes to the root of the problem, and deals with the evils in a slower but in a more effective way. And I am going to try, by an appeal first to history, to show you how India gradually fell, and out of that to draw the lesson of how India may gradually regain her lost position.

Look back into the past and where do you find the first traces of decay in India? You go back hundreds, nay, thousands, of years and you find a mighty nation, prosperous and wealthy, with arts and manufactures, with the practical science of life, and the various classes of the community prosperous and happy. You find in that community religion ruling the thoughts of men and honoured in every part of the State. You find lofty intelligence, the creative intelligence that gave to India its mighty literature, the intelligence that wrote its philosophy, its dramas, its marvellous spiritual treatises, an intelligence so wonderful that to-day, when its products are translated by the wisest men in the Western world, they recognise the grandeur of the philosophy, they admit the sublimity of its spiritual work. Hand in hand with the mighty religion and the magnificent intelligence, you find a vast material prosperity; a prosperity so great that its decay

demanded ages of foreign conquest and internecine strife; even in the eighteenth century, you find that India was—after centuries of conquest, after invasion following invasion—still so wealthy that, to use the words of Phillimore, "the droppings of her soil fed distant nations". Which of these three things, the religion, the intelligence, the material prosperity, was the first to show the sign of decay? The spirituality. The first step downwards in India was taken when she began to fall in spirituality, when her teachers lost their ancient inspiration and became reproducers of the experience of others instead of having first-hand knowledge for themselves. The days passed away when the King from his throne would come down and bow at the feet of the half-naked Brahmana, because he was wealthy with wisdom and not with gold, and because the learning of the spiritual teacher won the homage of the loftiest and wealthiest. In those days the King himself, when he saw his grandchildren around him, would place his son upon the throne and go out himself into the forest to spend his last days in meditation and in worship. Those were the days when India was the greatest, those the days when she wielded the mightiest influence in the world. Gradually the fine light of spirituality became dim and lost brilliance, and then the second step was taken in the gradual decay of the creative intelligence. As the mind of man was no longer stimulated by the loftiest questions of philosophy, of spiritual knowledge, a change came over the intelligence of the nation. It lost its originality, its inspiration, it lost its creative power; it became more and more imitative and less and less original. Men no longer created great works of literature; they wrote only commentaries on the past, and disputed over questions of grammar, over questions of verbal interpretation. Thus intelligence came down slowly, step by step, until to-day you

search in vain for the creative power, only some glimmering is appearing where still spirituality is strong. The third step was in the gradual loss of material prosperity, the beginning of the decay that you see around you to-day. Her arts, no longer fostered by religion and intelligence, gradually lost their beauty, gradually began to fade away; her industries, no longer guided by keen intelligence, gradually grew weaker and weaker, and now they are on the point of following her perished arts. Arts and industries thus slowly decayed and with them inevitably the material prosperity of the land. As you look at India to-day, you see only one great industry, the industry of agriculture, surviving, and even that is by no means what it ought to be, by no means what it might be; the other avocations are gradually disappearing, they are ready to vanish away.

Such are the three steps of the national decline. First, spirituality; second, the higher intelligence; and third, material prosperity. If India is to rise again, if she is to stand high among the nations, how shall that be conducted? By retracing the past, by remounting the past steps in order. She must begin by reviving the spirituality, the root source of all. Then she must build and revive education, substituting for the present an education suited to the crying needs of the country; and when spirituality is re-established, when education is wisely chosen and wisely directed, then the restoration of the national prosperity is inevitable, it cannot be escaped.

Now, these facts can be further strengthened by the testimony coming from the history of other nations. You may study what nation you like in the past, and you will find the same thing to be true, that as long as religion was mighty the nation flourished;

when religion decayed the nation decayed. Take, if you like, ancient Egypt; in the person of her Pharaoh, religion and the State were conjoined. In the days of Egypt's mightiest power, religion was the guiding force in the State. If you take the modern Empire of Rome the same is seen; while religion was strong the Republic was mighty, and the devotion of her children built the Roman Empire. When religion decayed, when materialism took its place, not only did she gradually lose in literature, but her Empire crumbled into dust, it vanished from the face of the earth. If I had time, I might take you to nation after nation, and show you the same causes bringing about the same results. I ask you, if such be the testimony of history to the relation between religion and material prosperity, is it an unpractical thing, when one desires to help a nation to rise, to begin with the foundation on which all material greatness has ever been built, and to try to make that foundation strong, to build on it the edifice of national prosperity?

But there is not alone an appeal to history. Why should this be true? Here I appeal to intelligence. Judge you the cogency of what I say. What is the fundamental truth of religion? It is, without challenge, the Unity of the Self. One Life in all. One Life in every separate form. An underlying Unity amid a superficial diversity; that is the fundamental truth of religion and that is the basis of the brotherhood of man. Now out of that truth in general grows every virtue by which a nation becomes strong, by which a nation becomes great, by which a nation rises in the scale of peoples. Out of the belief in the One Life grows the recognition of the national life, and of the need in the nation for unity, patriotism, love of country. The public spirit without which no

nation can live and grow, the readiness to subordinate private interest to the common good, the readiness to sacrifice oneself for the sake of the larger self of the nation, these grow out of the recognition of the One Life. Without this there is no national life. You cannot have a nation, when the members of the nation do not recognise that the country has a greater claim on them than any narrower circle. When each man thinks for himself, fights for his own ends, follows his own aims, seeks his own interests without regard to the common interest, that nation is a dying nation, it has no possible future before it. The danger of India to-day lies in the lack of public spirit, lies in the lack of true and enlightened patriotism, lies in the lack of that love of country which is the inspirer of every noble action, without which there is no citizenship. However much men may prate of liberty and patriotism, there is no liberty where men are under the bondage of selfishness, and hold narrow and isolated views, and where self-interest reigns supreme. The men who live only for themselves are slaves. No liberty is possible until character is builded, and man's sense of duty to the country rules supreme. That sense grows out of religion; without religion no patriotism and no public spirit are possible; and without patriotism and public spirit there is no prosperity. The civic virtues grow out of religion.

That is the reason why we urge the question of religion as vital to the question of nationality. Not religion in the sectarian sense, in the petty quarrels with one another, but that spiritual religion which recognises the unity of all, and knows that the nation is a single body, and that if one organ is suffering the whole of the body must inevitably be suffering. I appeal to you because I have the right

to do so, since I love and serve India far more than most of you do. I venture to say, my friends and brothers, that the greatest danger for India in the future lies in the lack of public spirit. Occasionally, but only rarely, you get public spirit within the limits of a town; sometimes public spirit within the limits of a Province. One man says: "I am a Maratha," or "I am a Bengali"; another says: "I belong to the Panjab," a third says: "I belong to Madras." Where is the man who says: "I belong to India, she is my Motherland and her interests are mine"? That is the spirit which must gradually grow, if India is ever again to be great, and in stimulating the religious spirit we are stimulating the sense of unity, and are thus laying deep and strong the foundation of future nationality.

It is not only this that is wanted, but also the public spirit which makes the cause of the weak the cause of the strong, and which realises that wealth, strength and power are only held in trust for the defending and the helping of the weak. You see a man unjustly treated; do you spring forward for his defence as if he were your brother, or do you turn aside and say: "It is no business of mine, why should I interfere"? It is the business of every man when one man suffers; it is the duty of every man to speak, where one man is unjustly treated, or unjustly crushed. This is what is felt, where there is belief in the One Life.

Another great service that Theosophy does to India in relation to religion is that it teaches the value and the essential identity of all religions. The Indian nation of the future cannot consist only of Hindus; it must embrace the large minority that belongs to Islam, and the small, but prosperous, Parsi community, and a certain number of Christians. All these are Indian

born, and must go to the building of an Indian nation. At present the various religions separate Indians into more or less hostile camps; Theosophy alone, with its message of peace, can bind them into one. Within the Theosophical Society Hindu and Musalman, Parsi and Christian, meet as brothers, feeling no religious hatreds and separated by no religious jealousies. Each remains faithful to his own creed, but respects that of his neighbour, and the common truths, which all alike hold, form a strong bond of union. The friendship of religions, essential to the future of India, already exists within the Theosophical Society, and one great value of Theosophy to India lies in its eradication of religious hatreds and of religious disdain. Wherever it spreads, religious peace follows it, and it is thus surely removing the religious barriers which prevent Indians of different creeds from feeling themselves to be one nation. All religions have one origin and one goal; this Theosophy is ever proclaiming and proving; why then dispute about secondary differences? Live your own religion, it urges, and let your neighbour live his, and turn your attention to the great truths in which you agree, rather than to the minor points on which you differ. Those who seek to draw together Hindus and Musalmans find in Theosophy their most effective co-worker; for instead of seeking to ignore religion—an effort stamped by history with failure—it strengthens each man in his own faith, but fills him with love and respect for that of others.

*

You see then why we begin with the religious propaganda. Now Theosophy has passed to the second step, the step of education, and is concerning itself through the length and breadth of the land with the education fitted to the needs of India. What must that education be? First, of course, religious and moral; without that nothing can be achieved; that is essential and

fundamental; the building up of character in the young, so that they may be fit to be citizens of a country, so that they may grow into lovers of their own land. Let me tell you, as I have told many in India, how that love of country is fostered in the English Public Schools. They are not so foolish in England as to separate the intellectual training of their sons from religion, from morality. They know that these are essential in the education of the true citizen, of the lover of his land. If you go to an English Public School, like Harrow or Eton, you will find a building there, the College Chapel; week by week the boys gather in that Chapel; week by week they worship within those walls. Look at the walls and what will you see? In glowing colours, on brass tablets fixed all round the walls, you will see the names of old boys, who once knelt where the present generation is kneeling, who went out into the world to work for their country as soldiers, as explorers, as traders, as civil servants of every kind, who died in the service of their land, who gave their lives in order that England might be great. As the boys kneel in worship, their eyes are attracted by those brass tablets that adorn their Chapel walls; their very prayers are mingled with the thoughts of the heroes who once were boys where they are boys now; and a longing emulation is born within their hearts to repeat the deeds that immortalise the names glowing before them, to leave behind them also a memory that will not die, a name worthy to be blazoned on the walls for the loving veneration of generations yet to come. The passionate enthusiasm that you find in the young is used to make them patriots, lovers of their country, and that influence ingrained in them from religion makes them the lovers of England that they are. Such education should you give your sons. Is India not a country as worthy of the love of her children as any other

country in the world? Is your past less great than the past of England, or your story less wonderful than the story of her growth? Are not your heroes as great as hers, your children as mighty as any that she can produce? You have all the materials to turn the boys into passionate lovers of their country, and you leave out of their education all that is Indian, and then wonder that India is not great.

Theosophy took up that great problem. It declared that religion must be carried into the lives of the young. It first established boys' associations all over the country, where religion should be taught. But those associations were outside the school curriculum, outside the pale of Indian school instruction.

It next began to deal directly with the question, and gathering some members of its own body and other prominent Hindus together, it founded the Central Hindu College at Benares as a type. There Hinduism and morality on the basis of Hindu Shastras are taught, and the College has issued a series of religious and moral textbooks, which can be used in every school in the land. And see how the Indian community is rising to the sense of its duty. When we first began to deal with this problem, people told us we were Utopian, that no one would listen to us. But in five years the idea has swept over India, and we see on all sides efforts are being made to bring about the religious and moral training of Indian boys. Musalmans are doing the same thing for the Musalman youths at Aligarh, and we hope college after college will arise where religion will be taught, and that no boy will be taught a religion which is alien to the creed of his fathers.

Turn from that side of education to the side of the training of the mind. This is but badly done at the

present time. You foster, in the system of education here followed, that memory of Indians which is naturally wonderful enough, and you do not draw out and develop those qualities of reasoning, of observation, of quick judgment, of accurate understanding, which are less prominent to-day, because disregarded in our schools. You must change the method of literary education, if India is to rise, and train the whole mind, not only cram the memory. I read a little time ago that the object of education in India is to provide the Government with clerks. The object of education is not to enable a man to earn forty or sixty rupees a month, but to raise the intellect of man to understand the problems of life, to make him fit to be a citizen of a mighty Empire. Education is no education which trains the memory but does not evolve the reasoning faculties; it is no education which enables a man to answer questions by rote, but leaves him dumb before the great questions of life. The object of education is not to pass examinations, but to evolve the mental faculty, to make man, as he should be, a reflection of Divine Intelligence. That is the object of education, and not the manfacturing of clerks.

But it is not so much on the deficiencies of the literary education that I want to say some words to-night. The education that is wanted here is not only literary education. You have a great many, too many, Government servants; you have, if I may say so, too many lawyers; you have too many, far too many, men who are in the unproductive professions, who only shift about the wealth of the country but do nothing to increase it; the competition in the learned professions, in Government Service, is killing in its strain on the men of middle age to-day. The frightful competition drives down the reward of their

labour, so that your highly educated men have to starve on thirty or forty rupees a month. Where that is the case, you may be sure that the economics of education are badly guided. What you require in India now is to make your bright intelligent boys understand that they should turn their attention to other walks of life, in which they may serve not only themselves but their country at the same time. You want an education, scientific more than literary, an education that shall send out into the world men who are ready to revive industry and manufactures, men trained in the knowledge which will gradually improve the resources of the country. Take an illustration. You have mineral wealth beneath your soil; your hills are crammed with mineral wealth all over the country; it is possessed of the precious metals and of coal, iron, and other useful and valuable ores waiting for the working. How do you deal with them? You send over to England to get men to survey the country, to explore it, and to report upon it. Your own boys should be trained as mineralogists, surveyors, first-rate engineers, men who can utilise all that is found in the land. Why send abroad for what you should have at home, and why not send some of your brilliant lads into those paths of industry, rather than into the over-crowded professions? It is not only with regard to the mineral wealth of the country that your education is badly directed. Take the need of the knowledge of chemistry, specially, in your manufactures. Now on this I can strengthen my argument by an appeal to the leading educationists of England who are raising the same cry there, although it is not as much wanted as here. Lately in the British Association some of the leading educationists of the land gathered together and discussed the educational problem in England. They complained that the education was

lacking in the elements which can make a nation great, and they pointed out that the commercial supremacy of England was threatened by Germany simply because Germany gives a better education to her sons. I printed some of the figures in the *Central Hindu College Magazine*, because I wanted them to be widely circulated. I find it stated by Professor Dewar that in Germany there are four thousand five hundred well-trained chemists employed in various factories, in looking after manufactures, and as compared with this there are only fifteen hundred ill-trained ones in England. Four thousand five hundred in Germany, fifteen hundred in England; how many here? Can you get even one, one man of Indian birth, of Indian training, versed in chemistry, so that he may help to revive the dying industries of India? Without that there is no commercial prosperity; without that you will never be able to hold your own. A nation owes to its scientific knowledge its commercial and industrial growth. I said you want a chemist, an Indian chemist. You have one Indian, a genius, a wonderful man, a man who has made his way against countless difficulties until he stands in the front rank not of Indian but of European scientists—Professor Jagadish Chandra Bose. There you have a man who is perhaps one in a generation, a man of original genius, a man of marvellous power, and a man who has raised the name of India in the scientific world. He has made one of those discoveries that are epoch-making. Since Darwin's great idea of Evolution there has been no such epoch-making discovery as that made by Professor Bose. He has proved that there is but one life in the animal, in the vegetable, and in the mineral, and while speaking in England he was not ashamed of his ancient faith, but in the very face of England's great scientists he declared that what he proved by experiment was

the truth found and taught thousands of years ago by his ancestors on the banks of the Ganga, that there is but one life among the diversity of forms. Now take that man, a man of whom any country might be proud. How is he treated? He has no fully equipped laboratory in which he can carry out his most delicate experiments. He has had twice to travel across to England, in order to obtain the use of the apparatus without which he could not carry on his work; he has to teach boys in the Presidency College, and the brain that might make priceless discoveries is engaged in teaching boys, a task which hundreds of others could perform equally well. He should have a laboratory fitted with every modern improvement, he should have leisure to work independently on his experiments. England offered to build him a laboratory, offered to support him, so that he might carry on his scientific experiments, but he refused the offer; he said: "I am an Indian, I must go back to India; there are there, maybe, some young men whom I may help to train, if I live in my own land." That is the man you have here, whom you do not treat as he should be treated. Why, if he were an Englishman, Englishmen would put at his feet all that he needs. Why should he be so treated because he was born here, a native of India? I would that I could make many of you understand his value, so that this shame on India might be removed by some of her wealthy men, who could do it if they would.

Scientific education, then, is what you want. Men trained so that they can go out and revive your industries, improve your agriculture. Has it struck you how even the last remnants of Indian weaving are gradually dying? Men who were at the loom but some years since, are now at the plough. No country is safe where only one industry is practically found, and

you must revive manufactures, if Indian prosperity is to return.

But how are you going to revive them? We have reached our third step, the re-establishment of material prosperity. And this brings us face to face with the question that has arisen out of the selfishness of modern civilisation in the West. Great wealth is there face to face with the problem of labour in a way which, if you are wise, you will carefully avoid. In England, in France, in Germany, the sense of unity has not been sufficiently felt. It has existed as a feeling of nationality as against other nations, but not as an internal bond. The poor who produce have been separated by a great gulf from those whom they enrich with their labour, and hence out of the selfishness of the rich has arisen the great problem of labour in the West. You see English wealth and English splendour when you go to England; you see the glitter and the pleasure, you see the luxury of the West End of London, you see the wealth in the palaces of her nobility, you see the magnificence of her cities; which of you has seen the misery of her poor? I have seen it for many, many years of my life. I lived and laboured to do something, if possible, to relieve that frightful misery. I am not speaking out of books, I speak out of the experience of my own life. I was a member of the London School Board for the most miserably poor district in London, and ninety thousand children from that crowded Tower Hamlets attended the schools. It was my duty as a member to visit the schools, and what did I see? I saw little children in the cold of the English winter, barefooted, and with bare feet frost-bitten because of the bitter cold. I saw them fall from the form on to the floor, fainting. On inquiry I found that they had come to school

without one fragment of bread crossing their lips, and were fainting from starvation, at the same time that we were trying to train their brains. I have taken part in many a great labour struggle. I went into the houses of many during the great Match Strike that some of you may have heard of, where girls, young women, were starving on the miserable pittance that they received. I went into the homes of many, and I found little children of four and five tied in their high chairs at a table, and there employed in making match-boxes hour after hour, till they dropped asleep over their work. I saw them crying and sobbing, as the tender baby fingers were bleeding from the rough surface of the sand-paper which they pasted on the match-boxes. And when I said to the parents: "Why make these babies work thus?" The answer was: "Madam, if they do not work they starve." You have no poverty like that in India; nothing so terrible, nothing so degrading. A famine may kill thousands, but the slow starvation of thousands of the children of the poor of London is more terrible than the rapid action of the famine. One-tenth of the population of London, that city so great in wealth, splendour and civilisation, dies in the workhouses, in the gaols, and in the hospitals. One man out of every ten perishes in habitual destitution. I have seen little children with hands lacerated and flesh bleeding, because the child had to drive a needle with its palms through the coarse sacking of which sacks are made, paid for at the rate of sixpence per dozen sacks. And when I asked why the child did not buy the shield that would protect the hand, the answer would be: "I have not got a halfpenny, and it costs a halfpenny to buy a shield." Now why do I tell you these things? I tell you, because they are the outgrowth of selfishness, that does not care how the poor may suffer, provided great fortunes may be made.

I tell you this, because you are at the beginning of this possible experience, and I would save India from it. Why not take counsel, why not take advantage of the experience of Western lands, and then so arrange matters that when you make wealth, you should think of the makers as well as of yourself; that you should regard their health, their comfort, their welfare, as your own, and so prevent the brutalising poverty that is the danger that is menacing European civilisation to-day?

Gradually you will set up your manufactures, you will revive your industries. Take you care that in all your doings you do not treat men as machinery; that you think of the worker as well as the work. Remember that no country is really rich, where many of her people are miserably poor. Remember that no country is truly great where thousands of her children are plunged into dire poverty. And remember that these problems that are taxing English brains to-day are problems that you may avoid by remembering the One Life in all. For they are trying to deal with a problem there when it has grown great, while you may prevent the problem from arising here.

As I told you the dark side, let me say a word of the brighter side which lately has dawned on English industry. Some of the great manufacturers are religious men, and they have felt their consciences pricked by the miseries of their workers, and have begun a different kind of policy. They have built, outside the crush of the city, villages where all their work-people may live. They have built them comfortable houses, not only comfortable but also pretty, so as to make the sense of self-respect felt which does so much in the raising of a people. They have in those villages places of amusement,

coffee-houses, theatres, reading-rooms, libraries—places, where, after work is done, the worker may find relaxation and amusement. There are several of those villages now built by some of the greatest of the English manufacturers. Would it not be better to follow their example rather than that of the selfish ones, who have created the trouble and the danger? This is the recognition of brotherhood, of unity, which in some few cases at least is changing the face of the industrial relations in England between masters and men.

You may see now why I began with religion, and how it affects these practical problems of the day. You cannot solve them without the help of the deeper truths of religion, without the recognition of your fundamental unity. For that reason we press religion, we press education, and when these two things are rightly done, material prosperity must inevitably follow.

Nor can we omit, in considering this matter, that social betterment inevitably follows religious, moral and educational betterment, and that herein also Theosophy in India is doing yeoman service. In the revival of religion, men's minds are turned to the earlier conditions of Hindu social life, and they see there a flexibility, a freedom, an activity, that are not seen now, and they see also how much the dignity and position of the Hindu woman, and the learning and purity of Hindu priests, excelled in those days the social condition of to-day. That study of ancient ideals leads necessarily to the desire to apply them to modern life, and a wish grows up for the restoration of social happiness on the old lines and in consonance with national ideals, rather than for reforms based on Western ideas. The preaching of the ancient ideals by Theosophists is rapidly passing into

well-considered changes in the modern social system, changes which will restore society to a better state and re-establish nobler conditions. The abolition of child-marriage, the education of girls, the training of priests in literature and in right living, the promotion of inter-marriage and inter-dining between subdivisions of the same great caste—already sanctioned in South India by the present Shri Shankaracharya —the receiving back into social life of travelled Hindus who conform to their religious and moral obligations—all these attempts to restore old ideals in the place of modern abuses grow naturally out of the religious revival, and out of the giving of religious and moral education on the lines of the Hindu Shastras.

Such, then, it seems to some of us, my brothers, is the value of Theosophy in the raising of India. We began with the teaching of the unity, with the revival of religion. We passed on to the educational phase, and are now striving in a small measure indeed, but still effectively, to change the lines of the national education. We have aroused a feeling that seeks to better the social system, by a restoration of the old social ideals adapted to modern life. That is the work the Theosophical Society is doing, and I venture to say that such work should appeal to every lover of his country, to every patriot, to every friend of India, for only by labour along these lines can the future of India be made secure.

Make no mistake as to that future. There is no grudging feeling on the part of the English public in England with respect to India. On the contrary, the heart of England is open to India to-day as it never has been before, and she is beginning to recognise the priceless value of the great nation which has come within the limits of her Empire. Remember the wise words

spoken by Lord George Hamilton, Secretary of State for India, that the Government of India must be based on Indian feeling, Indian custom, Indian thought, and that what was good in England was not necessarily congenial or useful in India. What is wanted here is really the building of noble characters, of lofty-minded patriots, who will then be recognised by England as true representatives of India, with whom England will gladly take counsel as they prove themselves worthy. Do not suppose that England can make you either great or free. You alone can make yourselves great; you alone can make yourselves free. The greatness and the freedom of a nation depend on none save itself. No nation can be strong unless it has men of noble character, who are patriots, who are lovers of their land: and no nation can be free which is not worthy of freedom by the qualities of its citizens, by proving itself fit to be part of a mighty Empire. Great, then, are the opportunities that lie within your reach, greater than ever the future which is opening before you; but if you would seize the opportunity, you must begin by the building up of the character of the citizens, by the spreading of the feeling which makes a nation great. England cannot in this do much to help; it is you who must help yourselves. But this know of the country of my birth, that it is a country generous in its instinct, generous in its feeling, and it will gladly welcome and accept your counsels when it sees that they are worthy of acceptance. How great your future may be, if you will only rise to the possibilities of greatness, you so mighty in the past, so fallen now! That which made you great in the past, religion, keen intelligence, love of country, being intent upon the welfare of the masses, these are the things that alone can make you great in the future.

No use to look back to the past, save as inspiration for the future. I have been told that I flatter my Indian friends. I have been told that the appeal to India's past greatness is out of place, that such an appeal arouses vanity, does no real good. If I have sought to show you the greatness of your past, it is because as a nation is proud of its past, it is able to build its future. If I have sought to inspire you with reverence for that past, it is not that you may boast yourselves as children of the Rishis, but that you may win the self-respect without which no nation can be truly great. If you have their blood but not their spirit, if you have their physical kinship but not their spiritual likeness, if you have their external body but not their greatness and knowledge—then it seems to me that the great ancestry shames, rather than is a thing for pride and vanity. I want that you should look at the past only as an inspiration for the work of the present. And if I have sought to show you the contrast between the greatness of your fathers and the smallness of their children, I have done it that the pride in men's hearts may awaken, and that they may say: "With so great a past we are strong enough to make a mighty future."

Further, remember that, though in all this lecture I have spoken of men, the word men includes both sons and daughters, and not sons only. And you cannot keep the daughters out of your consideration. Until the girls also are educated, until they are taught and trained, until they know the glory of the past, and teach the children on their knees what India was and what India may be; until Indian mothers are also worthy of the Indian women of the past; until they become patriots as well as the men, and love the land as well as their husbands; until the curse of early marriage is removed which

makes the girl a child-wife and a mother while she should be playing with her dolls and learning in the school; until you restore that ancient institution of Brahmacharya which forbade students to enter into the married life until the student life was over—until these things are done in India, India must remain weak as she is to-day. Until the wisdom of your sons, of your daughters, is widened to work for the greatness of the future; until you remember that India had not only a Yajnavalkya but also a Maitreyi, a Gargi; until you remember that knowledge is just as much the birthright of the daughters of India as it is of her sons; until you remember that in the old days Indian women sang parts of the Vedas to which modern Indian women may not even listen from the lips of another; until you remember the India of the past, in order to restore what was great in her and to make her future worthy of it, India cannot rise; until then, appeals to the past must be made, which are heart-breaking rather than tending to vanity and pride. O my brothers and sisters, whom I love as though I were of your own race, for whom I strive and labour in order that your land may be what it should be in the future, I appeal to you, for your children's future depends upon what you do to-day! Your sons and your daughters, and not the grown men, I plead for, and I plead for the young ones, for those who may be great, for those who will make India what she should be. I cannot believe that India, once the mightiest of nations, shall not yet be the mightiest of that world-wide Empire which is being builded out of many nations to-day, the Empire to which this nation also should bring the strength of its immemorial past.

THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN THE LIFE OF A STUDENT[1]

A BOY'S life at school and college is so mapped out into necessary tasks and necessary play, that the question sometimes arises in his mind: "What time is there in my life for Religion; had I not better leave it alone till I am older?"

This idea has been much strengthened by the total exclusion of Religion from school and college life in all Government Institutions: that which his elders ignored in his instruction inevitably came to seem superfluous to the student. He naturally did not consider the reasons which rendered it imperative to restrict Government aid to secular teaching; he only saw that Religion had no place in the curriculum, and to exclude it from his life seemed a natural step. Only as the conscience of the nation has begun to stir on the subject, have the boys begun to ask with increasing interest the above question.

Let us ask what is meant by the word Religion. Religion is the expression of the seeking of God by man, of the One Self by the apparently separated self. This is its essence. This expression has three divisions: one intellectual, doctrines, dealing with God and man and their relations; one emotional, worship, which has many diverse forms and rites and ceremonies; one practical, living the life of love.

[1] **Reprinted from *The Central Hindu College Magazine*, 1903.**

Looking at Religion under these three heads, it will be easier to see its place in the student's life, than if we take it more vaguely and generally.

Doctrines of Religion : The broad outlines of these resemble each other in all religions, and a boy should be taught them according to the faith of his parents. There is no knowledge more necessary for a boy than the knowledge of the fundamental doctrines of his religion. This knowledge should therefore be imparted to him in a simple, elementary form in school, and in further detail in college. No controversial points should be raised, no philosophical disquisitions should be imposed; clear, definite statement of the main doctrines is all that is needed. Half an hour a day throughout school life would be time sufficient to equip the lad with this knowledge, and to enable him to answer intelligently any questions addressed to him about his religion.

Worship: Everybody should worship, recognising with gratitude the Source of life and strength and joy. The Hindu boy should daily perform his Sandhya, after bathing, according to the custom of his caste and family; if he does this, with concentrated attention and devotional feeling, he has fulfilled the duty of worship suitable to his state. He may also, if he likes, read and think over a shloka of the *Bhagavad Gita*. The duty of meditation belongs to later life, and he will gain such training of the mind in steadiness as is fitted for his youth, by the careful and attentive performance of his Sandhya.

The Life of Love : This is the religious duty which the boy must discharge all day long, and it is this which makes a life a truly religious life whatever may be its occupations. Let us see how a boy should

lead the life of love in school and college, the dharma of the student.

He must show his love to his parents and his teachers by diligent study and by prompt obedience. Youth is the time for study, and a youth wasted in idleness cannot later be made good. A man's usefulness to others depends largely on his education; the ignorant man cannot be a good and wise husband, father or citizen. A diligent, industrious boy is showing a religious spirit by this diligence and industry; if he practises these qualities from love and from a sense of duty, he is performing the dharma of his state. And he must be obedient, with the obedience of love, which is as complete out of sight as under the eyes of authority, which is prompt, cheerful and ungrudging, not slothful, carping and unwilling.

He must show his love to those around him by helping them in every way he can; if he is clever, he should help the dull boys with their lessons; if he is strong, he should protect the little lads, and never tyrannise over them. He should be brave, gentle, truthful, courteous; these qualities are all fruits of the fair tree of love. He must be chaste and must always be clean in his own speech and actions; and he must strongly protest against any coarseness of speech or actions in his fellow-students, and should especially be careful to protect the younger boys from bad talk and bad ways.

A boy who lives in this way during his school and college life, will, when he goes out into the wider world of men, practise there the virtues that in his school and college days he learned as part of his

religion. For there is no division between true religion and noble living: a religion that does not express itself in nobility of living is an empty shell; a noble life without religion is shorn of its fairest grace.

BRAHMACHARYA [1]

ONE of the customs of ancient India which has perished and needs to be re-established is that of Brahmacharya during the student life. In the old days a boy was given into the hands of his teacher, or Guru, when he was from five to seven years old, or sometimes later. From that day forward he lived in his teacher's house, serving him and studying under him, the period of study being nine, eighteen or thirty-six years, or until he had mastered his studies, and sometimes even lasting throughout the life. The first-named periods, of nine and eighteen years, were the ordinary ones, and at their close the lad was well developed and manly, fit to bear arms in the battle-field. In the exceptional case of Ramachandra, development was early, and He is said to have been only sixteen when He was taken by Vishvamitra to defend his altar from the attacks of the Rakshasas. More often the student period seems to have been extended till the youth was twenty-five years of age. Maturity, however, varied during the immense periods covered by Indian history, and the general rule may be said to have been that the youth had to reach manhood—to be a warrior in the Kshattriya caste—before he left the guardianship of his teacher.

During the whole of this period, the student was under the obligation of absolute chastity. Only after he had kept the rule of studentship, had left his

[1] Reprinted from *The Central Hindu College Magazine*, 1901.

teacher, and had returned home, might he marry. It was well recognised that the excitement and pre-occupations inseparable from marriage were destructive of the single-minded devotion to study which is necessary for its due effect on character. It was also recognised that the strain on the nervous system and on the whole body, which accompanies fatherhood, could not safely be imposed on boyhood. Resistant strength in manhood can only be obtained by using all the vital energy of youth in building up muscle and nerve, accumulating force, and storing it up in the body. The flaccid muscles and nervelessness, the langour and sloth of the debauchee, only shew the result of excess in very patent form. These same defects, though in far less measure, accompany the premature expenditure in youth of forces which should be kept in the body for the building of a vigorous manhood. Over-early parentage is as ruinous physiologically as it is injurious mentally.

The effects of the modern system of early marriages are visible on every side in India. Her students are tired when they should be in the first flush of vigorous manhood, and at the age when they should be doing their best work—from 40 to 60—they are old men. The languid acceptance of evils that should be resisted, the passive submission to wrongs that should be redressed, come from the lack of physical vigour. The race is slowly dying from exhaustion, and the exhaustion is largely due to the accumulating hereditary results of boy-fatherhood and girl-motherhood. It is true that the inner cause of these, as of other evils, is spiritual degradation; but I am dealing here only with one of its results.

It is no answer to this to quote individual cases of strength; it is the slow sinking of the general average which is a Nation's signal flag of national peril.

And even where men are strong, there is generally noticeable in them a dislike of exertion, a wish for physical inaction, which speak eloquently of the lack of vitality in the system.

For nature cannot be defied without ruin. Nature is the garment of God, the phenomena of Nature are the workings of the Gods, the laws of Nature are expressions of the Divine Nature. To go against natural laws is therefore to go against God, and persistence in such a course means death.

Hence all abuse and excess in natural functions means disease, which is a partial death, and premature decay, which is an early death. In this way nations disappear, which refuse to conform themselves to natural laws.

Boys who wish to have a healthy, vigorous manhood and a healthy old age, must be Brahmacharins during their student life. And this does not mean only that they must not marry, but also that they must be pure in thought and act. Secret vice is a thousand-fold worse than premature marriage, and is far more fatal to health. It means lassitude, destruction of nerve and brain-power, disease, and a miserable old age. Men often lament, in bitter physical suffering, the vices of their boyhood, but it is then too late to remedy them. For your own sake, and for India's sake, my young brothers, be pure, be pure.

EVOLUTION [1]

AMONG the teachings which have revolutionised human thought there is none more marked in its results than that of Evolution. There exists much difference of opinion as to its details and its methods, but as to the main fact of the gradual, regular unfolding and the increasing diversity and complexity of forms, there is no longer any discussion among educated people.

Many people, however, regard the establishment of Evolution as the theory which alone explains the conditions of things around us, as the crowning glory of the nineteenth century. And, indeed, this is true so far as Western thought is concerned. But Evolution, the gradual unfolding of the inner powers of the life, the Self, is clearly and definitely taught in the ancient Hindu Scriptures, as witness the following passage from the second Aranyaka of the *Aitareya Aranyaka*, second Khanda :

1. He who knows the gradual development of the Self in him (the man conceived as the *uktha*), obtains himself more development.

2. There are herbs and trees and all that is animated, and he knows the Self gradually developing in them. For in herbs and trees sap only is seen, but thought (*Chitta*) in animated beings.

3. Among animated beings again the Self develops gradually, for in some sap (blood) is seen

[1] Reprinted from *The Central Hindu College Magazine*, 1901.

(as well as thought), but in others thought is not seen.

4. And in man again the Self develops gradually, for he is most endowed with knowledge. He says what he has known, he sees what he has known. He knows what is to happen to-morrow, he knows heaven and hell. By means of the mortal he desires the immortal—thus is he endowed.

5. With regard to the other animals, hunger and thirst only are a seed of understanding. But they do not say what they have known, nor do they see what they have known. They do not know what is to happen to-morrow, nor heaven and hell. They go so far and no further, for they are born according to their knowledge.

Here we have the distinct succession of vegetables, lower animals, higher animals, man, clearly taught, and moreover the reason for the evolution—the developing, the unfolding, of the Self—is asserted; that great truth without which Evolution, as taught in the West, remains incomplete and unintelligible.

A PLEA FOR THE SIMPLER LIFE OF THE EAST [1]

THE subject we are to consider this evening is one of vital importance to the Sinhalese as a people. And one of the most encouraging signs of the day, practically all over Asia, is the way in which the Asiatic peoples are beginning to take their destinies into their own hands, and to endeavour to shape their own civilisation according to eastern ideas. Now these movements, that we can see rising up both here and in every other eastern land, are not, as a superficial observer might suppose, of interest and value only to the eastern peoples immediately concerned in them. It is true that these are the peoples who will be primarily benefited thereby. But we cannot separate East from West when we are considering the evolution of humanity as a whole, and East and West embody different views of life, and take up different attitudes with regard to the great problems of humanity. Both attitudes have their value. Both attitudes are necessary for the growth of humanity in the future. And it is necessary for the welfare of all, and not only for the welfare of the East, that the eastern view of life, the eastern attitude, the eastern habit of thought, shall be preserved for the benefit of the world at large. Looking, for a moment, from this standpoint, at this one wide view of the future evolution of the race, we can readily see, if we look back some

[1] A lecture delivered under the auspices of the Ceylon Social Reform Society.

thirty years, that there was a great danger that the eastern attitude would be cast out of the coming life of man. It was not only that western nations had spread over eastern lands; it was not only that western trade was trying to find markets for itself in eastern countries and sometimes even forcing its trade upon the East, with gun and sword; it was not only that western habits of thought, western customs, and western ideas came behind the western trade and the western arms. There was a subtler and a more deadly danger that was threatening the very life of the eastern peoples—the spread of western education, imparting to the minds of the young glittering pictures and the glamour of western civilisation with its outer show of luxury; not showing at the same time what Westerns know—the horrible poverty and degradation which form the other side of that glittering western world. This was the real peril to eastern thought and eastern ways. The triumphs of science, the conquest of physical nature, the innumerable additions to the luxury of life and to the wants of man—all those things were sapping the very vitality of the eastern peoples. You found that English-educated young men were losing touch entirely with the East; that they were despising, because they were ignorant of it, the splendid literature of their past. They were fascinated by a younger philosophy, which had drawn most of its valuable ideas from eastern sources through the intermediary of Greek thought; they were fascinated by this, and, knowing nothing of their own, they raised the West above the East, and were ashamed of their eastern ancestry and eastern customs and life. And that deadly and subtle change was spreading over the eastern nations. Their literature was cast aside; their religions were despised. It was, of course, the result of ignorance, for no one who has

studied the religions of the East can dream of despising them or feeling for them contempt. Those who know western philosophy best, know how its greatest thinking is only a reproduction of ancient forms of eastern philosophy. Sometimes it has been said that it seems as though the German philosophers were reincarnations of ancient eastern pandits, and in truth, as you look through the philosophies of Germany, you recognise on page after page the potent logic of eastern thought reappearing in western garb. But it is not only the philosophic and religious lines that Easterns appear to forget; they forget also that in every phase of thought they can present a splendid literature to the world, whether on the line of poetic creation, whether on the line of drama, or of history—that vast stores of literary wealth were accumulated in the languages of the East. It is strange that, in our days, as the East grew more and more careless of its splendid literature, the West began to study it, began to admire it, and at the very time when Indians and others were turning aside from their own sacred books and their own literary treasures, Orientalists in Europe were beginning to translate those treasures from Sanskrit and from Pali and from Chinese. A series of the Sacred Books of the East was produced in this way, and these books were widely read and studied. So you see what western culture has thought of eastern literature and of eastern philosophy. You could not have a better testimony to the value of eastern literature and eastern thought than this, that though you were ready to let them die, the West was determined to preserve them, and to renew their influence on man. And, gradually, the East was awakened to a knowledge of its great treasures, to a realisation of its rightful place among the intellectual and spiritual realms of the world.

And thus eastern ideas, that attitude to life of which I spoke, were saved—the idea that learning is more valuable than wealth; the idea that intellect is greater than commercial success; the idea that the body is secondary and the intelligence and the spirit more important than the body—all that forms part of the eastern attitude to life. Looking back over eastern history, we see how continuously learning, wisdom, and truth were the objects of eastern endeavour. You find the learned man the real monarch, as it were, in eastern nations. And the monarchs of the sceptre and the crown, the monarchs who sat on golden and jewelled thrones, they would come down from those thrones and bow at the naked feet of the fakir and the ascetic, would travel far, often on foot, to seek out the thinker and the philosopher, deeming that the philosophy was greater than their royal splendour, and that the Kings of the earth might fitly bow before the half-naked mendicant who had some principle to teach, some knowledge to impart. That is part of the eastern attitude to life, vital for the future. For in the West, wealth has become a disease, and life is becoming vulgarised by the continual pride of gold. In America most of all, but, I am sorry to say, also in the older country, in England, the amount of a man's wealth has become the mark of his social consideration; and the result is that all society is becoming vulgarised and coarsened; for the man who has collected gold, "the self-made man," as he is called, he is the man who has made his own fortune in the competition of the modern market, and that man is often rude, he has no culture, he is not highly educated, he has not even ordinary good manners, he is rough and crude and vulgar in his ways, he is coarse in his talk. Yet that is the type of man who is beginning to rule society. These are the

money-kings of the West; they are not Kings among men in wisdom; and these men are the most highly honoured in western lands, honoured daily more and more. And the result is the vulgarisation of national life. And that is why we need there, in the West, the assistance of the East, in order that we may have once more a truer standard by which real worth shall be measured. I said that the glitter of that western civilisation was casting its glamour over the minds of your young men at one time—men who are now middle-aged and becoming old. They knew very little of western civilisation. They only knew the outer culture of it. I have often wished, when I have heard young Indians talk about the splendour of western civilisation, that I could take them to what I saw and knew of that civilisation, its misery rather than its splendour; that I could take them through the slums of London, through the miseries of eastern and southern London, and show them the starving children, the miserable women, the desperate men, show them the filth and the squalor and the brutalisation of life, show them how men and women became degraded, and children live lives from which any animal would recoil—I wish that that side of western civilisation were familiar to your young men. I hope that when next any of them are in London, they will look through these parts of London, for they need some knowledge of them to correct and complete their ideas of western civilisation. It is all very well to go to the drawing-rooms of the rich, but what of the slums and the garrets of the poor? Those are aspects of western life which you ought to know. Great wealth has its extremes always, for extremes of wealth are only purchased by extremes of poverty. The two are inseparable. You cannot have one without the other. You have not yet in these eastern lands anything of the misery, the degradation and the

wretchedness which are the commonplace of life in London among the poor.

I see that you are trying here to set on foot a national movement. Now what is the essence of such a movement? Not blind antagonism to the foreigner—that is only the excess of reaction—but the determination to make your own national characteristics the leading features of your civilisation, and only to accept from the foreign civilisation that which can enrich your own without injuring it. That is the great canon by which you should judge how much of the West you will take to weave into the fabric of your eastern nationality. On that point, the English in their own land set you an example. They are always ready to take up and study the literature of other peoples. They have their own oriental professors who teach their young men to become familiar with eastern learning and eastern thought. But they do not denationalise themselves. They take what is good and valuable from every nation with whom they come into close contact, but they remain English still. And so should you do. You should take what is valuable in the English civilisation—and there is in it much that is valuable to you—but remain Sinhalese through it all. Take from other nations whatever of value they have to give you; learn their science, for that is their special contribution just now to the thought of the world; profit by their discoveries; utilise what they really have of value in their scientific thought; but put upon it the hall-mark of Ceylon. Let your coinage, as it were, your mental coinage, bear the imprint of your own nation and not the imprint of the foreigner. Let it enrich, do not let it debase your coinage. Give it your own spirit and your own colour. Then, just as language grows richer by weaving into its own fabric words from other

tongues, as the English language is a composite to which many another tongue has contributed—for it takes words from Sanskrit, from Hindustani, from Greek, from Latin and from Arabic, wherever it finds a word which expresses aptly a human thought, yet colours it with its own genius, its own spirit, and remains the English language still— so with your Sinhalese civilisation, enrich it as much as you will, by infusing into it the gold, only the real gold, from foreign countries, but let it remain eastern, let it remain Sinhalese still.

Do not debase, but only enrich ; do not denationalise, only increase the circle of your national thought. Then the contact will be useful and not death-bringing ; then you will be better for the teaching of it, and not the worse ; not corrupted but the purer for the contact.

And now let us see how this may be done. First, guard your literature and its influence upon your national life. Let your boys and girls know their own language and literature better than they know the language and the literature of other lands. No Englishman would neglect his own literature in learning oriental books. In the English schools, English literature comes first, others second. Over here, let Sinhalese literature come first and others second. It is much more important that your boys should know their own past than that they should learn the past of Greece and Rome and England. That is only a matter of culture. But the knowledge of your own past is the bread of daily life. To know what Ceylon has done shapes the lines for what Ceylon can do ; and out of the treasures of your past, you must shape the national ornaments for your future. Teach, then, your boys and girls their own literature and inspire them with love for it, with pride in it. And remember, when you are teaching

your boys and your girls, that the mother-tongue is the proper vehicle for the instruction of the young of every people. A great mistake is often made when, to the difficulties of the English language, you add the difficulty of teaching other subjects in a foreign tongue. What would Englishmen say if a teacher told them: "I want all your little boys in this school to learn geography and arithmetic and history in German and in French"? They would at once say: "Why are you going to put this unfair tax upon the children's brains?" The mother-tongue is the natural channel for instruction; the foreign language should be a second language, and the mother-tongue should remain the medium for all the teaching in the school: I don't mean that you should not teach English while the children are young. It should be taught, but it should be taught as a language, and not employed as the medium for instruction in other matters. Taught as a language, yes; because a little child learns a language very much more easily than when he is older. Older people cannot acquire a new language so readily as a child, and a child of seven or eight or nine or ten picks up a foreign language very, very quickly as a language for conversation or for reading and writing. But to teach that little child geography and history and arithmetic and the rest of his school subjects through the medium of that language means that he is made to learn nothing well, for he is so puzzled over the medium of the teaching that he has not thought and brain enough left to grasp the subject which he ought to learn. English people over here do not appreciate that, when knowledge is conveyed through a foreign medium to the child's brain, the acquisition of knowledge is continually rendered burdensome. It is all very well for us who are English. English is our mother-tongue, and English people are very ready to laugh at the

blunders made in English by one of another race. I wonder if it strikes these people how few of us can express ourselves correctly in a language which is not our own. We do not always know—some of us do, but not always and not all of us—we do not know how many blunders we make when we try to speak in the language of others. Only, the Easterns are too polite to laugh at us. I often hear Anglo-Indians talking about Babu-English. I also sometimes hear my Indian friends talking of the blunders of Sahab-Hindustani and Sahab-Urdu, and I assure you it is far more shocking than Babu-English, far more absurd, far more ridiculous. I have often seen Indians, when they are among themselves, go into paroxysms of laughter over their own language as murdered by the Commissioner and the Collector and the District Judge. In the presence of the blunderer himself, however, they keep a quiet face; their politeness teaches them that, and their courtesy to the foreigner, a courtesy which the foreigner unhappily does not often reciprocate. It would be well for the English people to remember that for every one of us who can talk an eastern language without perpetrating the most ludicrous blunders, there are hundreds of Indians and Sinhalese who talk remarkably pure English.

That is no reason why the Sinhalese boy, or girl, in learning what he is taught at his school, should not have most of the instruction given to him in the mother-tongue. Another point of very great importance, in the building up of national feeling, is that all forms of teaching should be illustrated from familiar objects in the child's own country, from the products of his own country and not from the products and objects of a foreign land. You have here, put into the hands of teachers, primers of elementary science, the illustrations of which are all drawn, as a rule,

from the objects familiar only in England. When we wanted to teach botany, for instance, to our boys and girls up in Benares, I could not buy anywhere a single picture to hang upon the walls in which Indian plants were selected as illustrations for teaching botany in India. To make your teaching alive, you must teach the child through the medium of the forms of plants he sees around him, the things which he meets in daily life. The teaching is dead without it. It is all words to the child, unless he is taught from the objects of his own country.

If you want to teach botany here, you should teach it with the help of Sinhalese flowers—you have enough of them—with Sinhalese trees, Sinhalese products of every kind, and then the child's mind fixes the thing taught with the aid of living pictures and makes it a part of the child's ordinary life. It is no longer a lesson to be delivered in the school but it becomes part of the furniture of the mind. So with all your scientific teaching, it should be illustrated to the child by objects that the child can find in the fields and the country around him. Or again, when you teach history, it is as well to know something of the world's wider history, but the history of your own country is the most important of all. Never can you keep a nation living, if the children of it are not taught about the national story and about the heroes of that story. What is the good to us up in Benares of having the life of Nelson to teach our Indian boys? You cannot make patriotism by teaching Indian boys what an English admiral did. Nelson is an inspiration to the English boy. His life has been written for English boys by an English poet, and to them it is a life which beckons and inspires. But for your boys, the deeds and the struggles and the victories of an English admiral have

no meaning and no message. If you would inspire your boys with patriotic fire, you must pick out the lives of your own Indian heroes and tell their stories to them and then they will learn that. If you would make your school-books what the English school-books are to the English boy, if you would write your own books, written by Sinhalese men and published by your own Sinhalese people, with illustrations drawn from your own Sinhalese history, heroes from your own national story, which will inspire feelings of patriotism in your children, if you would write the stories of your own great Kings, your own warriors, your own statesmen, and place *them* as examples for the Sinhalese boy to follow—ah, then you would make feelings of patriotism which would build the Sinhalese nation.

Along these lines, then, may your Reform Society fairly take up its work: Education above all—for that is the lever—for the lifting up of a nation is in its young. We, old people, grow hard and stupid. You cannot do much with us. But the boys and the girls of to-day—*there* is the material for the future, and education is the tool with which the work of the future is to be done. If you want it to be done rightly, then write stories about the Sinhalese past and the Sinhalese heroes, and put them into the hands of your children, just as we have written stories in India. Tell them of the great and good men of the past—who were children of their own Motherland, heroes of Indian and Sinhalese life, both men and women—those will go to the hearts of the boys and the girls of this land; and you will not have to complain of the want of patriotism or of public spirit in the next generation, if you train the young generation of this along these lines in your own schools.

Passing from this question, take that of science. Take the science of medicine. Religion and the science of medicine were germane, allied, in India. It is perfectly true that along some lines the West has made valuable discoveries in medical science. But it does not seem to strike you, I think, as it should, that those remedies which are suitable for a beef-eating and alcohol-drinking people from many generations are not necessarily suitable for the more delicately shaped and more cleanly fed bodies of eastern peoples. Your heredity is not the heredity of the West. When generation after generation you have, as over there, bodies fed on beef and pork, you get a very different nervous system, a very different kind of muscle and tissue, and the remedies that do for the one are killing for the other. When, for hundreds of years, bodies have been poisoned by all forms of alcohol, these bodies react to drugs very differently from the reaction you get in the eastern body. If you would only open your eyes, you would see what that curse of Christendom, the drink habit, has done in the East. When the drink habit establishes itself among an eastern people, it ages and kills as it does not age and kill in the West. The bodies are different, the climate is different. Drink is spreading here. It has spread in India. And the result is that the life grows shorter. Men who take up the habit die in what ought to be the flower of their age. If you want a striking example, go to Rajputana and look at the royal families there, at the men bred of the royal race, which of old presented one of the most splendid physiques in Asia. What do you find to-day? Go to palace after palace, and see Maharaja after Maharaja, and you will find that they are all boys. If you ask why, you receive the answer that their predecessor died young. Was he sober? No. That is the question and the answer that you hear over and over and over

again. The Hindu religion does not permit intoxicants. The Mussalman religion does not permit intoxicants. And yet; Mussalman and Hindu die of *delirium tremens*, and leave little boys to be put on the gaddi, under the care of the Resident or of the Government Agent. It is not a rare thing in India. It is a common thing. A few old men, a few rulers there are still, who look upon drink as an abomination. They live to be old men, and they leave full-grown sons to succeed them on the gaddi. We could hardly have a clearer illustration. Alcohol is a slow poison in the West. But for one of the eastern race, it is a quick poison. I asked one day some of my friends up in Lahore, some of my Indian friends who have become westernised: "Why do you take drink, when it is forbidden by your religion?" They answered: "Well, Mrs. Besant, we do not drink because we like it, but it is sometimes very awkward if we do not. We have often to go to the Viceroy's or the Lieut.-Governor's for dinners, and they always have wine there, and if we do not use it, especially when the health of the Queen-Empress is proposed—the late Queen was living then, for this took place some four or five years ago—if we do not take it, the Sahabs think we are disloyal." I said: "That is all nonsense. If you had the courage to say: 'My religion forbids me to drink,' there is no Sahab who would think you disloyal. On the contrary, he would respect your courage and think well of you." Many of you, perhaps, will know that the present King-Emperor has thoughtfully declared that he regards his own health drunk in water as quite as good as his health drunk in wine. So that the fear of disloyalty at least may be thrown aside; whether the Sahabs like it or not, you have no reason to poison your bodies. Leave that to the West; don't bring it here, this

western vice, and these western evils which we see are unhappily taking root here.

Why cannot you take the western virtues and leave the western vices alone? Some of the virtues which I would wish to see copied very much are virtues which you may very well copy: promptitude, accuracy, the power of controlling the will, punctuality in any work you take up. Those are western virtues, specifically, although they were not always so. Get those. Leave the vices to those who like to have them. Don't think you pick up culture because you break the law of the Lord Buddha against the eating of flesh and the drinking of intoxicants. You are only ruining yourselves and you are not gaining the respect of anybody else.

Let us pass from that to another question, a question of sentiment, the question of dress. Some people imagine that the question of dress is an unimportant question, but that is not true—pardon me if I put it bluntly. The question of dress is a question of sentiment, and sentiment has a great deal to do with national feeling. Sentiment feeds very much on this question of national feeling, and national feeling is strengthened by national costume. If you must change your own costume (I do not know why you should) you might at least change it for the better and not change it for the worse. The most enthusiastic Englishman will not pretend that his clothes are things of beauty; he may say they are things of convenience, though even that is not really true in eastern lands.

I do not know why western people have grown ugly in their dress. They used to be better dressed. Even at the beginning of the nineteenth century, there was still a good deal of grace and beauty in the dress of an Englishman. Now—the less said about it the

better. It is the ugliest costume in the world, and why on earth should you take it up? Why do you want to make yourselves ugly, when you might as well be handsome? This question of dress is really an important thing, quite apart from the fact that the English dress is so inartistic and ugly, because it is especially a matter of health. Eastern dress in a hot country is a light dress, such as we can wash every day. The Indians wash their clothes every day, and they are always neatly and cleanly dressed. There is not one of my westernised Indian friends who would not be ashamed to wear twice the same Indian clothes, and the result is health and cleanly appearance; but when you get, as you sometimes do, Indians who take to wearing English clothes, you often meet some who in their own homes would never wear clothes so soiled, such as they wear every day in public, clothes which are worn threadbare, and which offend the sight, clothes which have lost the artistic delight, the grace and the shape of Indian clothes, and which are so sodden with perspiration that the man is not fit to come near you. And that for a people with whom cleanliness is a part of religion. Now why not put an end to that absurdity here and in India?

Now in India, we have many national costumes. In our Central Hindu College, we devised a boy's costume that would follow the national costume, and the uniform of the College is a sort of compromise between the Mussalman and Hindu costume. For all boys who come to us—and we have boys that come to us from all parts of India—and live in the Boarding House, we have this uniform, and boys who are dressed in this are artistically satisfactory, as well as, from the point of sanitation, healthy and well clothed. Occasionally when some boy,

desirous of showing off his greater superiority, gets some tenth-rate English clothes and comes out looking more like a groom than a gentleman, so strong is the feeling in the College that he gets very quickly laughed out of it, and afterwards we do not see these egregious garments any more. I wish you would create the same sort of feeling in your schools here, for nothing tends to the creation of national feeling so much as tastes formed in early boyhood. What you might do here is to try and reform the Englishman's dress. Try to persuade Englishmen that they would have a chance of becoming beautiful in dress for the first time in their lives, if they would adopt yours. See whether you cannot persuade them to become more beautiful by the adoption of your costume. The same thing applies to women. They, too, take in the same way to western abominations instead of keeping to their own graceful and artistic clothing; and, believe me, there is nothing so beautiful and so sweet as the eastern sari, and yet you abandon them in order to put on the English dress, with its long skirts and stays and even high-heeled shoes, and you think you are civilised. Those high-heeled shoes, I do not know why you wear them when all the world has given them up. All the western people are dropping the high heel, because they find that it is deforming the foot. There is no uglier object than a deformed foot in woman. Why, when English people laugh at the Chinamen for tying bandages round the feet of their women, they do not realise that they do worse, that they deform the feet of their own women with tight boots and high heels, only English, or rather womanly, folly can explain. Why is the one silly and the other not? The West has nothing valuable to give you in the matter of clothes, either masculine or feminine. Specially avoid English women's fashions. Their

fashions are characterised neither by convenience nor beauty. I am glad they are getting better in England now, but strangely enough you find, in the East, all the bygone fashions of the West.

And that brings me to the question of needlework. I went to the Maharani's School at Mysore, and when I asked to be shown the needlework done by the girls, I found that they were working samplers, things which you find done in coloured thread, with plants and objects like nothing in heaven or on earth or under the earth. In England, our grandmothers used to make these things. None of their granddaughters would dream of making anything so silly to-day. If you go into an English drawing-room, you will find these old samplers exhibited as objects of curiosity done by the grandmothers and the great-grandmothers of the present generation. They are not done in England to-day, and yet these were the things which I saw the girls at Mysore were learning. And yet we have here a very exquisite embroidery done in the old days by the deft fingers of Kandy women, and under the inspiration of the beautiful old art of the East, handwork of the most delicate and lovely character, things of beauty which Europe would not willingly let die, for which in the old days Europe competed ; every one of them the product of eastern girls and eastern women.

You make your girls forget those old, exquisite arts of needlework and embroidery, and you get them to work abominations of sofa cushions and samplers which have disappeared generations ago, even from the country from which you copy them. I really sometimes think that all the things Europe is tired of and discards are sent over here for the girls' schools to learn, leaving aside their own art, their

own handwork, and their own exquisite embroidery and manufactures. Every form of product, household utensils, household wares so exquisite and graceful, which India produced about the time of Elizabeth used to be sought after in Europe in the old days ; and even recently people were going everywhere collecting these marvels of Indian art. And there is still a market for them when such things get into the European shops. There are products of the handlooms in India and of art in other directions, fabrics so delicate, so graceful, that you can hardly see them if you hold them up to the light, tapestry so marvellous, it looks as though fairy fingers had been upon it. Such is the skill of fingers and deftness which belong to the East, and those eastern arts are being lost, because art of that kind is no longer cultivated. I was once told by a Lieutenant-Governor, who saw some of the work done by our boys between the ages of ten and eleven : "I thought that Indians who were so clever with their heads were not clever with their fingers." My answer was : "You do not give them the chance. There are no fingers so clever as eastern fingers, none so delicate, none so deft." But why do you leave them untrained when you might command the markets of the world ? The way to beat western products in your own market is not by copying western goods, but by making your own things along your own lines, and then, not only will you keep your own markets, but Europe will compete with you to buy them. Often do you hear the complaint over there : "You cannot get the old Indian things." No—because modern competition has killed them out. Why don't you utilise them to enrich your own people ? If you did that, if you turned back once more to the art which matches the genius of your own race, you might gradually regain your own place in the world's markets. You can do that, if

you only will follow your own models instead of working up to European models. You have colours here to which Europe cannot show anything similar. Your dyes, your vegetable dyes, entirely outshine the aniline dyes of Europe. I heard that the Maharaja of Kashmir had put a heavy duty on the importation into Kashmir of any aniline dyes; and then, when they came into the country in spite of the duty, they were burnt—the best thing he could do with them, the best thing he could do to keep Kashmir shawls in their place in the markets of the world.

But while I ask you to preserve your own ancient and beautiful things, I do not ask you to do so without discrimination. I say to you: study, and strive to keep everything that deserves to survive; but you want to discriminate, you want to judge what is best and what is worth preserving for the sake of humanity. Take, when you deal with art, the best period in your art, take the best literature in your own country, copy them and carry them still further. But you have one difficulty, some of you probably will not recognise. A good many people who have been trained in western civilisation are being born over here, just as a good many people who belong to the East are settling in the West. Their work here and there is to enrich the knowledge of the people among whom they are born at the time, and to use their influence to draw together the two civilisations.

There are two things that are necessary if you are to grow up into a nation, if you are to become once more the Sinhalese people, such as you were in the days of bygone glory; first, you must respect yourselves and not allow contempt from others. Now, sometimes, pardon me if I speak to you frankly—you encourage me to do that—I always protest in India and I should like to protest here, against hearing the

term "native". You cannot so much blame Englishmen for doing it, because you do it yourselves. I have heard educated Indians and I have heard Sinhalese use that word just in the way in which the Englishman uses it. You know very well that he uses it as a term of contempt. I was travelling one day in India with three of my Indian friends, gentlemen of high culture, in a railway carriage. While the train was waiting at a wayside station, an English lad put his head into the carriage and quickly withdrew it saying: "Oh! they are all natives here." He said that and went away, but he said it in such a tone as showed that he used it as a term of contempt. Well, that is not quite the sort of thing one likes to hear, but let me tell you it is encouraged by the Easterns themselves. You ought to protest against it. Even the Secretary of State for India protested in open Parliament once when a member of the House of Parliament spoke of the Indian Army as the Native Army. The Secretary of State rose and said that that was not the term which ought to be used in that House with regard to the Indian Forces. Take care that you do not pick up that careless term and use it for the people of. Ceylon. "Native" means "savage," "barbarian"; that is the sense in which it is used, not in the sense of "born in the country". It is a contemptuous term employed with regard to the coloured man. That is one point that you need to remember. No eastern man who respects himself should allow his lips to use that term. Respect yourselves and do not allow others to insult you.

The other is the question of religion. You have many religions in this land, but the vast majority are Buddhists, and Buddhism must be the dominant note of the civilisation of Ceylon. If you desire that the differences of religion should not

prevent your growing into a nation, then you must all learn to take the attitude which Theosophy takes up: that every religion is a revelation of the same Divine Wisdom and should be respected by all. Whether you follow the Buddha or not, you must learn to put aside all ideas of antagonism in religion, you must learn to feel that all religions are but revelations of the same truth. You must learn to put aside all ideas of converting people from one religion into another. You must put all religions on one platform and respect each the faith of the other. Cast aside the old, narrow hatreds; put away from you the old feelings of enmity between members of one religion and members of another. Learn to regard all religions as friends and sisters, not as antagonists and rivals. You must learn to respect your neighbour's faith as much as you respect your own. Look upon all religions, as they are really, as branches of the one True and Divine Wisdom, each suited to different conditions and adapted to different periods of men's evolution, helping different temperaments along the lines best suited to their development. You have here a Sinhalese nation and a religion which is suited to the evolution of your nation. Let all drop religious animosities, and let all meet to help each other, not to quarrel. Let each understand that he has something to teach and also something to learn. And so you will enrich your nation with your religious differences, instead of letting them prevent the national union of the Sinhalese people.

Let the old antagonisms die. Let your country be the greater for the religious differences. Let the common welfare of the nation be the care of every religion. Let each religious community train its own children in its own faith, and not try to get at the children of other religions and make them apostates

in the home of their fathers and mothers. Only thus can you have religious peace and religious respect. Do not let your ship of nationality be shipwrecked on the rocks of religious hatred and religious suspicion. Learn mutual respect. Learn that each has something to learn from the religions of the rest of mankind: from Buddhism learn that heart of love and infinite compassion which is the great characteristic of the Law of the Buddha; from Christianity learn that spirit of self-sacrifice which is the great mark of Jesus, the Christ; from Hinduism learn that note of Law, of Order, incorporate in that untranslatable word, Dharma; from Zoroastrianism learn that spotless purity of thought and word and action, which is the distinguishing mark of Zoroastrianism; from Islam learn that realisation of the Unity of God, which is the insistent message of that faith. Why quarrel? Each faith has its own characteristic. Make all these characteristics part of your own Sinhalese nation.

Let each learn from all, and quarrel with none. Show each other the respect which shall leave the child's mind untainted, and do not make differences in the family of which you are all members by trying to steal from any religion the unformed minds of the children of that religion. Let Christians teach Christianity to the young ones of their faith. Let the Hindu teach the Hindu children. Let Mussalmans teach their children Islam. So shall the value of every faith be yours, and you shall grow wise and liberal, and mighty in wisdom, in mutual respect. In this Reform Society there are men of every faith. No religious uproar or discord keeps you out from this common work. Why, then, should it keep you apart in other walks of life? Why should religious differences keep you from

uniting for national ends? Let the energy of the West wedded to the wisdom of the East help you in this great common task. So shall your Reform Society be a power for good, and so shall the names of the pioneers in this work go down in Sinhalese history as the new founders of Sinhalese nationality, as the protectors and guardians of the ancient civilisation of this island.

It is necessary to give a list of Mrs. Besant's books on the subject of Indian Religious Thought at the close of this department, which would give an idea to the reader how widespread and all-embracing is her grasp of the subject, which makes her exposition unique.

BOOKS

Ancient Ideals in Modern Life.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1900. Contents: The Four Ashramas; Temples; Priests and Worship; The Caste System; Womanhood.

Avataras.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1899. Contents: What is an Avatara? The Source of and Need for Avataras; Some Special Avataras; Shri Krishna.

Basis of Morality, The.

A study of the relative value, as basis for a system of morality, of revelation, intuition, utility, evolution and mysticism.

Bhagavad-Gita.

Translated by Annie Besant and Bhagavan Das with Sanskrit text, free translation into English, a word-for-word translation and an introduction on Sanskrit Grammar.

MEMORIA
D. P. R. I.

Buddhist Popular Lectures.

A series of eight popular and eloquent lectures on Buddhist topics delivered in 1907 in Ceylon. They deal with the living Buddhism of to-day and touch upon many religious and social problems connected with that great Faith.

Building of the Kosmos, The.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1893. Contents: Sound; Fire; Yoga; Symbolism.

Dharma.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1898. Contents: Differences; Evolution; Right and Wrong.

Esoteric Christianity or the Lesser Mysteries.

A sympathetic and beautiful interpretation from the Theosophic standpoint of Christian doctrines and ceremonies. Deals with the Person of Jesus. Each chapter throbs with spiritual vitality. The book has a wide sale.

Four Great Religions.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1896. Contents: Hinduism; Zoroastrianism; Buddhism; Christianity.

Hindu Ideals.

Written for the use of Hindu students in the schools of India. Contents: Eastern and Western Ideals; The Hindu Student; The Hindu Householder; The Hindu Marriage; The Hindu State; The Hindu Religion.

Hints on the Study of the Bhagavad-Gita.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1905. Contents: The Great Unveiling; As Yoga Shastra; Methods of Yoga—Bhakti; Discrimination and Sacrifice.

In Defence of Hinduism.

A vigorous defence of the beliefs and practices of Hinduism, especially written to help Hindu boys to answer the attacks levelled against their religion.

Introduction to Yoga, An.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1907. Contents: The Nature of Yoga; Schools of Thought; Yoga as Science; Yoga as Practice.

Laws of the Higher Life, The.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1902. Contents: The Larger Consciousness; The Law of Duty; The Law of Sacrifice.

Mysticism.

Contents: The Meaning and Method of Mysticism, The God-Idea, The Christ-Idea, The Man-Idea, Interpretation.

Path of Discipleship, The.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1895. An amplification of the substance given in *In the Outer Court.* It describes the stages of moral and spiritual growth through which the candidate must pass in order to reach the first Initiation, and in addition tells of the qualifications needed to pass the next four Initiations leading up to Masterhood. Contents: First Steps; Qualifications for Discipleship; The Life of the Disciple; The Future Progress of Humanity.

Questions on Hinduism with Answers.

A useful collection of questions answered in *The Central Hindu College Magazine*, classified in 28 Sections. Covers a wide range of ethical, social and ritualistic problems of modern Hindu thought.

Religious Problem in India, The.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1901. Contents: Islam; Jainism; Sikhism; Theosophy. Companion to *Four Great Religions.*

Some Problems of Life.

Contents: Problems of Ethics; Problems of Sociology; Problems of Religion; Some Difficulties of the Inner Life.

Spiritual Life, The.

Vol. II. of Essays and Addresses. Contents: Spiritual Life for the Man of the World; Some Difficulties of the Inner Life; The Place of Peace; The Ceasing of Sorrow; The Use of Evil; Man's Quest for God; Spiritual Darkness; The Perfect Man, etc.

Sri Rama Chandra: The Ideal King.

Some lessons from the *Ramayana* for the use of Hindu Students. Companion volume to *The Story of the Great War.*

Story of the Great War, The.

An able summary of the *Mahabharata*, the great Indian epic. The original in Sanskrit is too long for any but a specialist to read, yet a knowledge of the characters in this great epic is necessary in order to understand Hindu literature. This little book serves such a purpose in an admirable manner. Companion to *Sri Rama Chandra.*

Superhuman Men in History and in Religion.

Manifestations of Superhuman Beings in Our World; Saviours of the World; The Christ in Man; Restoration of the Mysteries; Conditions of Intellectual and Spiritual Growth; Policy of the Theosophical Society.

Theosophy in Relation to Human Life.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1904. Contents: Theosophy in Relation to Religion; Theosophy in Relation to Sociology; Theosophy in Relation to Politics; Theosophy in Relation to Science.

Three Paths to Union with God.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1896. Contents: The Karma Marga; The Jnana Marga; The Bhakti Marga.

Universal Text Book of Religion and Morals, The.

Part I. Religion.
Part II. Ethics.
Part III. Vol. I. Hinduism.

An endeavour to show the fundamental unity underlying the various religions.

Contents of Part I: The Unity of God; The Manifestations of God in a Universe; The Great Orders of Living Beings; The Incarnation of Spirit; The Two Basic Laws; The Three Worlds of Human Evolution; The Brotherhood of Man.

Contents of Part II: The Object and Basis of Morality; The Relation between Morality, Emotion, Virtues and Vices; Classification of Virtues and Vices; Virtues and Vices in Relation to Superiors; Virtues and Vices in Relation to Equals; Virtues and Vices in Relation to Inferiors; Interaction between Virtues and Vices.

Each chapter is followed by illustrative quotations taken from the Scriptures of the great religions of the world. A true eirenicon sent out with the earnest hope that it may contribute to the recognition of the Brotherhood of Religions.

Wisdom of the Upanishads, The.

Theosophical Convention Lectures of 1906. Contents: Brahman is All; Ishvara; Jivatmas; The Wheel of Births and Deaths.

PAMPHLETS

Proofs of the Existence of the Soul.
The Meaning and Method of Spiritual Life.
The Value of Devotion.
Gurus and Chelas.
The Brotherhood of Religions.
Some Difficulties of the Inner Life.
Theosophy and Its Evidences.
Theosophy and Christianity.
The Reality of the Invisible and the Actuality of the Unseen Worlds.
Spiritual Life for the Man of the World.
When a Man Dies, Shall He Live Again?
A World Religion.
The Relativity of Hindu Ethics.
The Value of the Upanishads to Young India.

ANNIE BESANT'S

FAREWELL TO HER BROTHERS AND SISTERS IN INDIA ON THE EVE OF HER INTERNMENT

TO MY BROTHERS AND SISTERS IN INDIA[1]

"THESE are the times that try men's souls." Thus spake one who faced the fiery furnace of trial, and who faltered neither in faith nor in courage. It is ours to-day to face a powerful Autocracy, determined to crush out all resistance to its will, and that will is to prevent India from gaining Self-Government, or Home Rule, in the Reconstruction of the Empire after the War.

The National Congress has declared in conjunction with the All-India Muslim League, that India must be lifted from the position of a Dependency to that of an equal partner in the Empire. To that end they drafted a scheme of reforms, which proposed that the Legislative Councils should be much enlarged and elected on as broad a basis as possible, with a four-fifths majority of elected members, and that control of taxation and expenditure--the power of granting or refusing supply—should be placed in the hands of this Legislative Council, so as to subordinate the Executive to the Legislative Council. This is the feature of the scheme specially selected by H. E. the Governor of Madras

[1] Reprinted from *New India* of June 15th, 1917, on the day previous to the Serving of the Order of Internment. Mrs. Besant was aware of the fact that she and her two colleagues were to be interned. She had an appointment with H. E. Lord Pentland, the Governor of Madras, on June 16th and the above was written and published prior to that interview which was immediately followed by the Serving of the Order.

for reprobation, and although it had been planned—in consonance with the practice of civilised Nations—by the most responsible public men in the country, and accepted by the great mass of popularly elected delegates at the Lucknow National Congress and the Muslim League, 1916, His Excellency was pleased to aver that no Indian with knowledge of affairs would endorse it, and this soon after it had been endorsed by Mr. Madhava Rao, C. I. E., late Dewan of Travancore, Mysore, and Baroda.

The difference of opinion between the Governor of Madras and the large majority of educated Indians is a small matter; but the resolution to crush Home Rule by force is a very serious one. It is practically proposed to strangle by violence the political educative propaganda the Congress ordered its own Committees, the Home Rule Leagues, and other similar public bodies to carry on. We are therefore faced by the alternative of disobeying the mandate of the country or that of the Governor of Madras, an alternative which has been faced in the past by all countries which suffer under autocracies, and which India—the last great civilised country to be subjected to autocracy, save those under the Central Powers in Europe—has now to face. For myself, as a member of the All-India Congress Committee, I elect to obey the mandate of the country, in preference to that of the Governor of Madras, which has no moral justification behind it, which outrages British law and custom, and imposes an unwarrantable, and, I believe, an illegal, restriction on the fundamental Rights of Man. I know that this resolution of mine, setting myself against the strongest autocracy in the world in the midst of a disarmed and helpless people, will seem to most an act of madness, but by such acts of madness Nations are inspired to resist oppression. Others will

scoff at it as an easy martyrdom, deliberately courted; they have already done so, to discount it beforehand, they who would not face exclusion from Government House, let alone the loss of liberty, the seizure of property, and the exclusion from public life, which has been my one work and joy for forty-three years. When I was twenty-five I wrote, anonymously, my first Freethought pamphlet, and within a year, as I refused to attend the Sacrament I had ceased to believe in, I was turned out by my husband from his home. I did not then, and do not now, blame him, for the position of a Vicar with a heretic wife was impossible, and his friends urged him to the step. At twenty-six, at the end of July, 1874, I joined the National Secular Society, for the first time heard Mr. Bradlaugh lecture on August 2, and received my certificate of membership and had an interview with him a day or two later. On August 30, I wrote my first article in the *National Reformer*, and continued to write in it regularly, till he died in 1891. My real public life dates from my first public lecture on "The Political Status of Women," for the Co-operative Institute in August, 1874.

Since then my life has been given wholly to the service of the public, as I have seen service, so that the deprivation of the liberty to render service is the greatest loss that can befall me. I know that the selfish and the unpatriotic cannot realise this, but those who have a similar Dharma, they will understand. Apart from the joy of service, life has no attractions for me, save the happiness that flows from a few deep and strong personal attachments. To surrender liberty and touch with those I love is to me worse than death. But to live free and with them, a coward and dishonoured, a traitor to Dharma and to India, would be hell. I take the easier path.

Those who rob me of liberty will try to blacken me, in order to escape shame for themselves. The Defence of India Act was never intended to be used to prevent public political speech, free from all incitement to or suggestion of, violence, and accompanied with no disturbance of any kind. My paper could have been stopped by the Press Act, by forfeiture of security and confiscation of press. But the Government is afraid to face the High Court, which has already pronounced its former procedure to be illegal. An autocracy is ever afraid of law, and hence the Government takes the step of shutting me up—a cowardly course—and hopes to prevent any public protest by striking down all who resist it. The Defence of India Act is being used to suppress all political agitation of an orderly character, so that the Government may pretend to England that India is silent and indifferent.

Sir Subramania's brave action, followed by those of the Hon. Mr. K. V. Rangaswami Iyengar, the Hon. Mr. V. K. Ramanujachariar, Chairman of the Kumbhakonam Municipality, the Hon. Mr. B. V. Narasimha Iyer, Dewan Bahadur L. A. Govindaraghavier, Messrs. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, Mr. Rangaswami Aiyar of Madura, Public Prosecutor and Pleader, with the effective letter of Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, defending the Congress and League scheme against the strictures of the Governor—these all show the spirit of Madras, and will, I feel sure, be followed by many others of this city, now scattered far and wide over the country, enjoying their well won holiday, and unconscious of what is being done so cleverly by the Executive in their absence. If any attempt be made to justify my internment by pretence of my entering into or cognisance of any conspiracy, or communication with the enemy, I fling the lie in the slanderer's teeth. I know that some postcards with my portrait, purporting

to come from Germany and said to be seditious, have been sent to friends. I have been told of them, but have not seen a copy. They may have been fabricated in Germany, or by the C.I D. here, but I have nothing to do with them.

If it be said that I have carried on a "campaign of calumny," which I utterly deny, the fault lies with Lord Pentland, who could, once again, have forfeited my security and confiscated my press. But then his Advocate-General would have had to prove it in Court and before the Privy Council, and that he could not do. It is easy for a Governor, if he has no scruples, to calumniate a person from the safe security of a Council meeting at Ooty, and then to lock up the calumniated. Such is the natural course of an irresponsible autocrat.

Such men, to protect themselves, as we saw in the case of Sir Reginald Craddock, having silenced their victims, proceed to blacken and defame them before the world. How else can they justify themselves? When the dry facts as to poverty, starvation, over-taxation, illiteracy, are stated, they are "calumny". My little book, *India—a Nation*, was stopped because it stated them. It was "calumny". To say that the average life period in India is 23·05, that in England it is 40, in New Zealand 60, is "calumny". To publish a table of literacy in England, Japan, Russia, Baroda, and British India is "calumny". To show that the raised assessment on land in one district was balanced that same year in the increased debt of the raiyats to the sowcars is "calumny". To show by these and many other facts that the autocracy in India is not even efficient is "calumny". To quote ancient books to show the state of the country in the pre-British days is "calumny"—if it shows

widespread prosperity and wealth; if it tells of raids and wars, then it is history.

Let them talk as they will; they "come and go, impermanent". But Lord Pentland—a good but weak man, driven into tyranny by strong and ruthless men, like Messrs. Gillman and Davidson, our real rulers—will have to answer for his actions before the Indian public, before the British Democracy, before history, which records the struggles for Liberty, and before God. Will his conscience be as clear as

I hear, but gossip is unreliable, that to avoid internment I shall be told either to go to England or to promise to abstain from political speaking and writing. I shall do neither. I do not run away from a struggle into which I have led others, and leave them in the middle of the field. Our work has been wholly constitutional; there has been no threat, no act of violence; in nothing has the law been transgressed. We believed that we were living under the Crown of Great Britain, and had the constitutional right of speech and law-abiding agitation for reforms in the system of Government under which we live. Still, we were aware that we were living under an autocracy, which first punishes and then issues orders forbidding the act punished, and we took the risk; for the risk was personal, whereas the suppression of free speech means secret conspiracy leading to revolution, in which many suffer. I have often pointed out that in India liberty and property can be confiscated by Executive Order, and that therefore no man is safe; an Executive Order forfeited my security and deprived me of another Rs. 10,000. Now an Executive Order deprives me of my liberty. It is well. The world will learn how India is governed, and that while England asks India to fight against autocracy in Europe, and drains her

of her capital to carry on the War, England's agents use all the methods of autocracy in India, in order to deceive the world into the idea that India is well governed and is content.

What is my crime, that after a long life of work for others, publicly and privately, I am to be dropped into the modern equivalent of the Middle Age *oubliette* —internment? My real crime is that I have awakened in India the National self-respect, which was asleep, and have made thousands of educated men feel that to be content with being "a subject race" is a dishonour. Mr. Lloyd George said truly that Ireland's discontent was not material, it was due to the wounding of National self-respect, and therefore could not be cured even by prosperity. I have made them feel that to live under an autocracy, to dance attendance on Governors and Collectors, to be ruled and taxed without their own consent, to be told that they were not fit to govern themselves, to see young Englishmen in the Public Services of their country preferred to experienced Indians, to have highly paid Imperial Services for foreigners lording it over less well-paid Provincial Services for "natives"—"natives" being the natural owners of their own land, that these and a hundred other like things were intolerable and should be ended. Life does not consist in money and clothes, in motor-cars and invitations to Government Houses. Life consists in liberty, in self-respect, in honour, in right ambition, in patriotism, and in noble living. Where these are absent, life is not worth living. It is not the life of a man, in the image of God, but of a brute, well fed by his owner.

Thanks to Sir S. Subramania's splendid courage, he and I stand together in this fight for freedom, with the advantage, not shared by the other members of our gallant little band—who have proved their

right to be called leaders by springing forward to lead in the moment of peril—that he is well known in England through his work as a High Court Judge and the great praise of him by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and he is also personally known to His Majesty the King-Emperor. No one will believe that such a man is an inconsiderate and headlong agitator. His arrest, if made, will draw English attention to the state of affairs here. I also have the advantage of being personally well known in the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Holland, Australia, Italy, Canada, New Zealand, America, Denmark, Norway and Sweden, in the first five personally as a fighter for liberty of speech in political and social reforms, as a Trade Unionist, a member of "the old International," a Radical, and a Socialist, and in the rest by reputation; in all as a religious teacher. In Russia I am known as a member of the old "Friends of Russia," associated with Russian exiles in England, in the days of Stepniak. None will feel surprise that I am carrying on the old fight for freedom, here in India. Unless the Government can muzzle the whole Indian press as well as Reuter, the news of my internment will run round the world, and proclaim how England, fighting for liberty in Europe, and posing as its champion, is more false to liberty in India than she is even in Ireland, is in India an autocracy, naked and unashamed, under which neither liberty of person and speech nor possession of property is safe, being at the mercy of "Executive Orders," and these are discriminating, striking at one and leaving another; some can be terrorised; some can be bribed; threats are used to the timid; offices or titles are dangled before the ambitious. And we are to be punished because we stand by the principles for which England stands in Europe, and ask peacefully

and constitutionally for responsible Self-Government which we work for on law-abiding lines.

For me, I have worked for India in India for nearly 24 years, and for 14 years before that in England; my *England, India and Afghanistan* is as outspoken as *India—a Nation*. In India, I have worked for the old religions and for Islam and against perversion to Christianity; I have worked for education—the Central Hindu College, now the centre of the Hindu University, and the Theosophical Educational Trust are my witness; I have worked for social reform on religious lines; I am still working for all of these, and in addition for that which alone can make these safe, for Home Rule for India, Self-Government within the Empire.

Only by winning Home Rule can India secure her material prosperity; only thus can she save what is left of her trade, her industries and her agriculture, improve them and reap the results of her own labour. The descent of Lever Bros. to capture the soap industry, crushing the nascent factories in Bombay, Madras and the U. P., is a prophecy of what will happen after the War with Imperial Preference—the fierce competition of British capitalists on Indian soil with Indian industries. It is said that the Government is going to sell their soap factory, created with Indian money, to Lever Bros. thus making it a British industry, but that I cannot believe. Lever Bros. is strong enough to crush the Indian manufacturers without Government help.

Indian labour is wanted for the foreign firms. Indian capital is being drained away by the War Loan—which is to bring no freedom to India, if the ...tocracy has its way. Indian taxation to pay the ... the War Loan will be crushing. When

that comes, India will realise why I have striven for Home Rule after the War. Only by that can she be saved from ruin, from becoming a Nation of coolies, toiling for the enrichment of others.

I write plainly, for this is my last word. I go into enforced silence and imprisonment, because I love India and have striven to arouse her before it was too late. It is better to suffer than to consent to wrong. It is better to lose liberty than to lose honour.

I am old, but I believe that I shall see India win Home Rule before I die. If I have helped ever so little to the realisation of that glorious hope, I am more than satisfied.

GOD SAVE INDIA. VANDE MATARAM.

Printed by Rao Saheb G. Subbayya Chetty, at the ... Published by Theosophical Publishing H...